DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 205 359 RC 012 876

TITLE	Institute of American Indian Arts. To Amend the Act of August 27, 1935, to Provide for the Administration, Maintenance, and Operation of the Institute of American Indian Arts by the Indian Arts and Crafts Board. Hearing Before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. House of Representatives, Ninety-Sixth Congress, Second Session on H.R. 6850.
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.
REPORT NO	House-Ser-96-45
PUB DATE	1 Jul 80
NOTE	105p.: Not available in paper copy due to small print size.
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Education: American Indian Culture: *American Indian Education: American Indians: *Art Education: *Arts Centers: Community Attitudes: *Facility Planning: Facility Utilization Research: Federal Indian Relationship: Federal Legislation: Hearings: *High Schools: Program Administration: *Program Implementation: Secondary Education: Tribal Sovereignty: Trust Responsibility (Government)
IDENTIFIERS	Bureau of Indian Affairs: Congress 96th: Indian Arts and Crafts Board Amendments Act 1980: *Institute of American Indian Arts NM: Pueblo (People)

ABSTRACT

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs met July 1, 1980, to take testimony on Bill H.R. 6850 which proposed specific statutory authorization for the Institute of American Indian Arts (IAIA), transferred administrative control from the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) to the Indian Arts and Crafts Board (IACB), and reserved the BIA educational facility in Santa Fe exclusively for the Institute's use. The Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies testified that his committee supported the bill and recommended renovation of the Albuquerque Indian School (AIS) for use as a Pueblo high school. The bill was opposed by the Department of the Interior and a panel of members of the Pueblo community, who wanted the Santa Fe facility returned to them for use as a high school, and stressed the need for academic programs and the feeling that the AIS was in a bad location. The National Congress of American Indians favored a new art institute at a location to be determined by the tribes. The Zuni Tribal Council supported the bill but recommended appointment of a governing body expressly for the IAIA. A representative from the North American Indian Museums Association stated that the bill did not provide for Indian involvement in the IACB. (CM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

RC

INSTITUTE OF AMERICAN INDIAN ARTS

JUL 1981
ERIC/CRESS
RECEIVED

HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-SIXTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

H.R. 6850

TO AMEND THE ACT OF AUGUST 27, 1935, TO PROVIDE FOR THE ADMINISTRATION, MAINTENANCE, AND OPERATION OF THE INSTITUTE OF AMERICAN INDIAN ARTS BY THE INDIAN ARTS AND CRAFTS BOARD

HEARING HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C.
JULY 1, 1980

Serial No. 96–45

Printed for the use of the
Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
73-476 O WASHINGTON : 1981

ED205359
RC012876

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

MORRIS K. UDALL, Arizona, *Chairman*

PHILLIP BURTON, California
ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER, Wisconsin
ABRAHAM KAZEN, JR., Texas
JONATHAN B. BINGHAM, New York
JOHN F. SEIBERLING, Ohio
HAROLD RUNNELS, New Mexico
ANTONIO BORJA WON PAT, Guam
BOB ECKHARDT, Texas
JIM SANTINI, Nevada
JAMES WEAVER, Oregon
BOB CARR, Michigan
GEORGE MILLER, California
JAMES J. FLORIO, New Jersey
DAWSON MATHIS, Georgia
PHILIP R. SHARP, Indiana
EDWARD J. MARKEY, Massachusetts
PETER H. KOSTMAYER, Pennsylvania
BALTASAR CORRADA, Puerto Rico
AUSTIN J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania
NICK JOE RAHALL II, West Virginia
BRUCE F. VENTO, Minnesota
JERRY HUCKABY, Louisiana
LAMAR GUDGER, North Carolina
JAMES J. HOWARD, New Jersey
JERRY M. PATTERSON, California
RAY KOGOVSEK, Colorado
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana

DON H. CLAUSEN, California
Ranking Minority Member
MANUEL LUJAN, JR., New Mexico
KEITH G. SEBELIUS, Kansas
DON YOUNG, Alaska
STEVEN D. SYMMS, Idaho
JAMES P. (JIM) JOHNSON, Colorado
ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO, California
DAN MARRIOTT, Utah
RON MARLENEE, Montana
MICKEY EDWARDS, Oklahoma
RICHARD B. CHENEY, Wyoming
CHARLES PASHAYAN, JR., California
ROBERT WHITTAKER, Kansas
DOUGLAS K. BEREUTER, Nebraska
MELVIN H. EVANS, Virgin Islands

CHARLES CONKLIN, *Staff Director*
STANLEY SCOVILLE, *Associate Staff Director and Counsel*
LEE MCELVAIN, *General Counsel*
FRANKLIN DUCHENEAUX, *Special Counsel on Indian Affairs*
GARY G. ELLSWORTH, *Minority Counsel*

CONTENTS

Hearing held: Page
July 1, 1980 1
Text of H.R. 6850 2

TUESDAY, JULY 1, 1980

Statements:
Hart, Robert 40
Hill, Richard, chairman, North American Indian Museums Association, presented by Ray Gonyea, assistant museum director 38, 86
Horse, Ella Mae, officer, National Congress of American Indians 32, 76
Knuffke, Hon. Darrell, Deputy Under Secretary, U.S. Department of the Interior 17
Lewis, Robert E., Governor, Pueblo of Zuni 35, 80
Panel consisting of:
Delfin J. Lovato, chairman, All Indian Pueblo Council 23, 67
Benny Starr, representing Santo Domingo Pueblo 26
Alvino Lucero, representing Isleta Pueblo 27, 73
Paul Bernal, representing All Indian Pueblo council 28
Paul Tafoya, representing Santa Clara Pueblo 29
Yates, Hon. Sidney R., a U.S. Representative from the State of Illinois 13

APPENDIX

Additional material submitted for the hearing record from:
Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:
Department of the Interior report on H.R. 6850 6
Background on H.R. 6850 10
Section-by-section analysis of H.R. 6850 12
Hon. Sidney R. Yates, a U.S. Representative from the State of Illinois:
Prepared statement 43
Paper entitled "Indian Arts and Crafts Board—Development of Indian Cultural Institutions" 52
List of Commissioners and former Commissioners of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board 55
U.S. Department of the Interior: Prepared statement of Hon. Darrell Knuffke, Deputy Under Secretary 59
National Congress of American Indians: Prepared statement of Ella Mae Horse, officer 76
Pueblo of Zuni: Prepared statement of Robert E. Lewis, Governor 80
North American Indian Museums Association: Prepared statement of Richard Hill, chairman 86

INSTITUTE OF AMERICAN INDIAN ARTS

TUESDAY, JULY 1, 1980

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:03 a.m., in room 1324, Longworth House Office Building, Hon. Morris K. Udall (chairman of the committee) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. The full Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will be in session this morning. Today we take testimony from public and administration witnesses on the bill, H.R. 6850, by Congressman Yates.

The bill provides for the transfer of the administrative operation and control of the Institute of American Indian Art from the BIA to the Indian Arts and Crafts Board. Both of these agencies are in the Department of the Interior. The bill would provide for the first time a specific statutory basis for the existence and operation of the Federal Indian Art Institute.

In addition, the bill also provides that the BIA educational facility at Santa Fe, N. Mex. will be used exclusively for the Institute, which is now housed there. Other uses of the facility would be phased out over a 3-year period.

Without objection, a copy of the bill and the report of the Department will be made a part of the record at this point.

[The bill, H.R. 6850; Department of the Interior report on H.R. 6850; background on H.R. 6850; and section-by-section analysis of H.R. 6850 follow:]

I

96TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 6850

To amend the Act of August 27, 1935, to provide for the administration, maintenance, and operation of the Institute of American Indian Arts by the Indian Arts and Crafts Board.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 18, 1980

Mr. YATES introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

---

A BILL

To amend the Act of August 27, 1935, to provide for the administration, maintenance, and operation of the Institute of American Indian Arts by the Indian Arts and Crafts Board.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Indian Arts and Crafts Board Amendments Act of 1980".

SEC. 2. The Congress finds and declares that (1) American Indian art and culture has contributed greatly to the artistic and cultural richness of the Nation; (2) the United

States owes a responsibility of trust to the tribes of the American Indian and the members thereof; (3) as an integral part of that trust responsibility the Federal Government should assist in the preservation and development of American Indian art and culture and the training of Indian artists and artisans to carry out that purpose, for the benefit of the American Indian and for the cultural enrichment of all citizens of the United States; (4) the Institute of American Indian Arts was established by the Department of the Interior in 1962 in Santa Fe, New Mexico, to fullfill the aforesaid purpose and responsibility; (5) as a result of mismanagement and neglect by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Institute of American Indian Arts has not been given the opportunity to accomplish its goals; and (6) whereas the Indian Arts and Crafts Board was established within the Department of the Interior in 1935 by Public Law 74–355 to promote the development of American Indian arts and crafts and has been successful in great measure in accomplishing its purposes, it is therefore appropriate and desirable that the task of administering the Institute of American Indian Arts in Santa Fe, New Mexico, be transferred within the Department of the Interior from the Bureau of Indian Affairs to the Indian Arts and Crafts Board.

SEC. 3. (a) The proviso in subsection (h) of section 2 of the Act of August 27, 1935 (25 U.S.C. 305b) is amended by

striking out "all" both places it appears and inserting "at least 75 per centum of all" in lieu thereof.

(b) The proviso in subsection (i) of section 2 of such Act is amended by inserting "(except in connection with any scholarship program approved by the Secretary of the Interior)" immediately after "money".

(c) Section 2 of such Act is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (i) as subsection (o); and

(2) by inserting immediately after subsection (h) the following new subsections:

"(i) the procure temporary and intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code;

"(j) to reimburse individuals who provide services to the Board without pay, for travel and transportation expenses, including per diem, to the same extent as individuals described in section 5703 of title 5, United States Code;

"(k) to administer, maintain, and operate the Institute of American Indian Arts established in Santa Fe, New Mexico, by the Department of the Interior in 1962, including taking all appropriate steps toward the attainment of accreditation status comparable to other fine arts academic institutions;

"(l) to solicit, accept, and sell and transfer gifts, bequests, devises of money, securities, and other properties of whatever character;

"(m) to acquire, hold, maintain, use, operate, and dispose of such real property, including improvements thereon, personal property, equipment, and other items, as may be necessary to enable the Board to carry out the purposes of this Act;

"(n) to construct new structures and renovate and repair existing structures on the campus of the Institute of American Indian Arts;".

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Interior shall transfer all administrative powers and responsibility for performance of all functions of the Institute of American Indian Arts from the Bureau of Indian Affairs to the Indian Arts and Crafts Board. Occupation of the campus of the Institute of American Indian Arts in Santa Fe, New Mexico, by any entities other than the Institute of American Indian Arts shall be phased out within three years following the enactment of this section, upon a schedule determined by the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 5. The Board shall submit an annual report to the Secretary of the Interior and to the Congress on the activities, accreditation status, and enrollment of the Institute of American Indian Arts.

United States Department of the Interior

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20240

JUL 1 1980

Honorable Morris K. Udall
Chairman, Committee on Interior
and Insular Affairs
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Mr. Chairman:

This responds to your request for our views on H.R. 6850, a bill "To amend the Act of August 27, 1935, to provide for the administration, maintenance, and operation of the Institute of American Indian Arts by the Indian Arts and Crafts Board."

We oppose the enactment of H.R. 6850.

H.R. 6850 would require the Secretary of the Interior to transfer all administrative powers and responsibility for performance of the functions of the Institute of American Indian Arts from the Bureau of Indian Affairs to the Indian Arts and Crafts Board. Occupation of the campus of the Institute by any other entity would be phased out over a 3-year period. The bill would amend the Act of August 27, 1935 (49 Stat. 891), which created the Indian Arts and Crafts Board, in order to provide for the Board's administration of the Institute. The bill would also require the Board to report annually to the Secretary and the Congress on the activities, accreditation status, and enrollment of the Institute.

The Institute of American Indian Arts (IAIA) was created by the Secretary of the Interior in 1962. It was opened that year to 140 carefully recruited students in the 10th through 12th grades, and to a few post-high school studio students who took two post-secondary academic courses. Emphasis at that time was upon the secondary programs.

From the beginning the Institute has been a progressive arts school which has encouraged its students to draw upon their cultural heritages while experimenting in such non-traditional areas as creative writing, performing arts, filmmaking, photography, and new forms of painting. The purpose of this approach was summed up in the Institute's statement of philosophy:

> The underlying philosophy of the program is that unique cultural tradition can be honored and can be used creatively as the springboard to a meaningful contemporary life.... The Institute holds that cultural differences are a rich wellspring from which may be drawn new creative forces relevant to contemporary conditions and environments. We believe that, ultimately, by learning to link the best in Indian culture to contemporary life, the young Indian will be able to solve his own problems and enrich the world scene in the process.

During its first five years, the work of the Institute's students attracted widespread attention throughout the Nation for its artistic validity and vitality in the fields of creative writing, fine arts, crafts, and performing arts. In 1967, the Institute embarked on an expansion of its professional training programs. The successful expansion was recognized by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which in a 1969 report recommended that the Institute be raised to the level of a four-year college and noted that the Institute had shown considerable success in instilling pride in Indian students by providing them with opportunities for creative expression. In recent years, the Institute has gained accreditation to grant the Associate of Fine Arts degree and, as an accredited institution, has the endorsement of the National Association of Schools of Art. The Institute is well on its way to achieving accreditation as a four-year institution.

Institute graduates are establishing a record as practicing artists as they mature in their careers. Their works make up an invaluable collection of contemporary art in a variety of media which is housed in the IAIA Museum in Santa Fe. The collection is in great demand and is often on loan to other national and international institutions. IAIA's position as a leader in minority cultural development was pointed out in the 1979 UNESCO Report, "Educating Artists, Craftsmen, Designers." In the report, IAIA was cited as one of seven outstanding arts education institutions in the world.

While we share the concern underlying H.R. 6850 that the Institute is different from other Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) schools and should be so treated, we believe that legislative resolution of the issue is neither necessary nor desirable. The Secretary, using powers available to him under the Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1950 (64 Stat. 1262, as amended) may transfer the IAIA to any other Departmental entity without legislation.

Indeed, a recent Secretarial decision under that authority has transferred responsibility for the Institute from the Bureau of Indian Affairs to the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs. We believe that shift achieves the goals at which H.R. 6850 aims, but avoids the problems which we see in a transfer to the Arts and Crafts Board.

The Indian Arts and Crafts Board was originally created for the very narrow purpose of helping Indians economically by expanding the market for their arts and crafts. It has done that important work well and continues to do it well, but it does not and cannot operate schools. Transfer of the Institute to the Board would, we believe, also result in insulating and isolating the Institute from the other

aspects of Indian affairs of which it is so important and interdependent a part and deprive it of the leadership and guidance otherwise available to it through the Native American Council of Regents (NACOR) and the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs.

It is true that the Institute has suffered from inconsistent direction and support over the years. A recent additional problem was the decision to transfer high school students from the Albuquerque Indian School to the Institute's Santa Fe campus. Many already concerned about the Institute's future viewed this as a serious threat. The tensions which have resulted from the joint use of the campus have served neither the Institute nor the high school students; indeed, the accreditation of both institutions has been jeopardized in the process.

We believe the recent Secretarial decision transferring the direct responsibility for the Institute to the Assistant Secretary will, along with other related decisions, preserve the Institute and foster its achievement of the promise so apparent in past years and so lacking in recent ones. We believe that the transfer will give the Institute the visibility and attention it deserves.

Other measures we plan to take with respect to the Institute are to--

(1) seek the immediate renovation of the Albuquerque Indian School so the Pueblo students can be returned as promptly as possible to safe classrooms and dormitories and so the Santa Fe campus can be restored to the use of the Institute;

(2) direct the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs to establish a management team, using the resources of the Office of Policy, Budget, and Administration, the Office of Indian Education, and such other resources as are necessary from within and outside the Department, to develop an efficient management strategy for the Institute;

(3) place full authority for the Santa Fe campus in the hands of the President of the Institute to eliminate the tensions which now stem from shared administration; and

(4) work with the Native American Council of Regents in developing long-range goals for the Institute and to clarify and strengthen the Council's status so it can assume, to the extent possible, the functions normally associated with boards of regents in the management of post-secondary schools.

We are committed to the preservation of the Institute and the achievement of its purpose. We believe that our recent decisions will assure that preservation and achievement. We therefore oppose the enactment of H.R. 6850.

The Office of Management and Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely,

James A. Joseph

Under SECRETARY

BACKGROUND ON H.R. 6850

H.R. 6850 provides that the Institute of American Indian Art, located in Santa Fe, New Mexico, would be transferred from the administrative operation and control of the Bureau of Indian Affairs to the Department of the Interior's Indian Arts and Crafts Board.

From the 1890's to 1962, the Bureau of Indian Affairs' facility at Santa Fe served as a high school (Santa Fe Indian School) for the nineteen Pueblos and the other area tribes. In 1962, upon the recommendation of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board, and others, the Bureau of Indian Affairs established the Institute of American Indian Art and housed the new Institute in the Santa Fe facility.

The Institute has, from its inception, offered both a high school program and college programs with a strong focus on Indian art and culture. As of 1979, the Institute was attempting a transition to a fully accredited junior college offering an Associate of Fine Arts degree.

The Indian Arts and Crafts Board was created by the Act of August 27, 1935 (49 Stat. 891; 25 U.S.C. 305 et seq.) for the primary purpose of promoting the economic welfare of Indian tribes and individual Indians through the development of Indian arts and crafts and the expansion of the market for the products of Indian arts and craftsmanship. The Board is located in the Department of the Interior, but is independent of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Recently, there has been severe criticsm of the operation and administration of the Institute. The Office of the Inspector General of the Department reviewed the operation of the Institute and submitted a report to the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs in June, 1979, which was extremely critical and which questioned the continued use of the facility for the purpose of the Art Institute.

In addition, the All Indian Pueblo Council representing the nineteen Pueblo tribes of New Mexico have petitioned the BIA to return the school to the Pueblos for high school purposes. The Institute would be relocated to some other existing BIA post-secondary facility.

H.R. 6850 proposes to resolve these problems by (1) giving the Institute a statutory authorization; (2) by transferring administrative control from the BIA to the Arts and Crafts Board; and (3) by reserving the Santa Fe facility exclusively for the Institute's use.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF H.R. 6850

Section 1

Section 1 cites the name of the Act as the "Indian Arts and Crafts Board Amendments of 1980".

Section 2

Section 2 contains congressional findings relating to the role of Indian art and culture in the United States; the responsibility of the United States to protect and foster such art and culture; the alleged mismanagement and neglect by the Bureau of Indian Affairs of the Institute of American Indian Art in Santa Fe, New Mexico; and the appropriateness of transferring the operation of the Institute from the Bureau of Indian Affairs to the Indian Arts and Crafts Board.

Section 3

Subsection (a) amends section 2 of the 1935 Act establishing the Indian Arts and Crafts Board to permit not to exceed 25% of the employees of the Board to be covered by the Indian preference laws.

Subsection (b) amends section 2 of that Act to permit the Board to operate a scholarship program approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

Subsection (c) amends section 2 of that Act to add six new subsections which provide that the Board (1) can procure temporary and intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code; (2) can reimburse volunteers for travel and transportation costs; (3) can take such steps as are necessary to assume operation of the Institute and bring it into

an accredited status; (4) can solicit, accept, and sell and transfer gifts, bequests, etc.; (5) can acquire and use real and personal property as is necessary to carry out the purposes of the legislation; and (6) can construct new, or renovate existing, structures as necessary.

Section 4

Section 4 provides that the Secretary of the Interior will transfer operation of the Institute from the Bureau of Indian Affairs to the Indian Arts and Crafts Board and that occupation of the campus facility at Santa Fe, New Mexico, by other entities would be phased out over three years.

Section 5

Section 5 requires the Board to submit annual reports to the Secretary and the Congress on the Institute.

The CHAIRMAN. Our first witness is the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies, my old friend, Sidney Yates.

[Prepared statement of Hon. Sidney R. Yates, with an attachment may be found in the appendix.]

STATEMENT OF HON. SIDNEY R. YATES, A U.S. REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

Mr. YATES. My old friend, Chairman Udall.

The CHAIRMAN. Quite a switch. We generally come hat in hand to your powerful appropriating body. Here you are.

Mr. YATES. You may still continue to do that, Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to that.

The CHAIRMAN. Whatever the results will be, we will try to continue to heed your advice and counsel.

Mr. YATES. Good. I think we are engaged in a very important enterprise this morning.

I want first to express my gratitude to you for setting up these hearings and taking the time in a very busy legislative schedule to undertake these hearings. I do hope you will act expeditiously on it because it is a controversy that I think can be solved that presently is the source of a great deal of rancor in the Indian community and in the Southwest.

If I may go off the record for a moment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

[Discussion off the record.]

The CHAIRMAN. Back on the record.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, may I ask that my statement be made a part of the record.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be.

Mr. YATES. I do not propose to read it. I trust that the members of the committee will take time to read it. I am sure they will.

The CHAIRMAN. I consider it holy scripture, any advice that you have.

Mr. YATES. That is the gospel according to St. Udall.

73-476 O—81——2

I also would ask for unanimous consent that the hearings that we had before the subcommittee of which I am chairman be placed in the files of your committee. I think it is much too long to be made a part of the hearings, but I think it should be made available to your members and your staff in the event you want it.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be done.

Mr. YATES. We will furnish approximately 30 copies of the hearings for your committee. We held hearings on this subject beginning September 6, 1979. We went into it rather comprehensively at that time.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, I am sure your committee is the recipient of the report by the departmental task force on the Institute of American Indian Art dated June 25, 1980, a very responsible task force made up of Jana McKeag, Clydia Nahwoosky, and Darrell Knuffke. I would commend its report for your consideration as well.

The CHAIRMAN. We have it and it will be made also a part of our committee's files.

Mr. YATES. I should have asked that various exhibits be made a part of my statement, including explanation of the development—operation of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board which is the board that I recommend be placed in charge of IAIA.

Trying to summarize my statement, Mr. Chairman, I would say this: We are presented with certain questions, should there be an Institute of Native American Art and Culture? Everybody agrees on this. The answer to that is obviously, yes, there should be an institution under Federal sponsorship which will take steps to protect the immemorial and eternal art and culture of the American Indian people.

The next question is, if we agree there ought to be such an Institute, should it be located in Santa Fe? I believe it should be. I think there is an unanimity of opinion on that. We have in the hearings, you will see, some suggestions that perhaps such an Institute should be incorporated into the curriculum at Haskell Institute or associated in some way with SIPI or perhaps moved to one of the colleges in the Southwest like the University of Arizona or University of New Mexico.

But there does not seem to be much support of that. Santa Fe is an artistic and cultural community located in the center of Indian country and in the center of a great background or a great outgrowth of some of the best Indian art and culture. That is why we suggest that Santa Fe be continued.

Should it be at the present Indian location? That is the controversy.

Many, many years ago, before 1962, the Institute was used as a high school for the Pueblo people. Your illustrious brother, Secretary of the Interior Udall, in 1962, with the then-Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Phileo Nash, acting on what they conceived to be a very important measure for the Indian community and because the number of students who were attending the Institute was diminishing, decided that the high school for the Pueblo students could properly be moved to Albuquerque, and I may say this was over the objection of the Pueblo people at that time but nevertheless it was done.

It was established as an Institute of Indian Art for all the Indian people. The high school was established at the Albuquerque Indian School.

We, the committee of which I am chairman, sent a task force to Albuquerque and to Santa Fe trying to determine what, if any, rehabilitation should be undertaken. The Albuquerque Indian School unquestionably is in a sad condition, at least in its dormitories. I have not seen it, but we sent an expert committee out there to review it. The dormitories are in bad condition but the location is a beautiful one and could be placed in first-class condition by the expenditure of approximately $7.5 million.

Two years ago, in order to try to solve the controversy, then-Assistant Secretary of the Interior Gerard moved three classes of Indian high school students over to the IAIA and those three classes are presently there. I think it is the intention and the will, at least of the Pueblo people, that more of the classes be moved over from AIS to IAIA and that eventually it be taken over as a high school. I think that is the nub of the controversy at the present time.

Rather than do that, our subcommittee has recommended that appropriate funding be made for the Albuquerque Indian School in Albuquerque.

We have provided $2,300,000 in our 1981 appropriations bill for the first phase of the renovation of the Albuquerque Indian School and we have added $500,000 for IAIA, to restore the appropriation of IAIA to the fiscal year 1980 level of $1,585,000.

In doing so, we are carrying out the recommendations of the departmental task force that was created by the Department of the Interior for the situation.

That task force, as you will note, provided for the continuation of IAIA as a center for Indian art and culture. It provided for building, for rehabilitating the Pueblo High School and making it a first-class school as far as buildings are concerned, or its physical condition is concerned.

Third, it recommended taking jurisdiction of the IAIA out of the BIA and placing it with one of the Assistant Secretaries of the Department of the Interior.

We agree with the first two recommendations of the investigating commission and we disagree with the third one. We do not believe it ought to stay in BIA and we do not think it ought to be placed under the jurisdiction of an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Rather, we think that jurisdiction over the affairs of the Institute should remain with the Native American Board of Regents which now controls its affairs and, second, we believe that the overall jurisdiction should be placed in the Indian Arts and Crafts Board which has a fine background, beginning in 1935, of support for development of the Indian arts and crafts.

It is eminently capable of supervising the operation of the Institute as a center of Native American art and culture and we believe that will be a logical—that is a logical supervisory institution for carrying on this work.

I dislike intensely finding myself in opposition to the wishes and desires of most of the Pueblo people, at least those who are exem-

plified by the testimony of Mr. Delfin Lovato who is president of the All-Pueblo Indian Council. And I feel that I am in the nature of an outsider in making this recommendation because I believe the recommendation and the judgment as to what should be done in this situation should be that of the entire Indian community.

I think that the Pueblo people should have a good high school for their children. I do not believe that it should be the IAIA because I believe that center belongs to all the Indian people and not just to the Pueblo community. I think what happens there should be in accordance with the wishes of the entire Indian community.

In my subcommittee we have sought to find that expression. It has been very difficult. I have tried to persuade the BIA, which annually sends out its request to the Indian tribes for their preferences under the band for analysis, to put one of the questions to them as to what their desires are respecting an Indian center for art and culture. The BIA has never done it.

Perhaps this committee may want to do it, although I think the work has already been done by the excellent report of the task force.

I think in essence, Mr. Chairman, that describes my views on the matter. I would be very glad to answer any questions.

The CHAIRMAN. It is a real pleasure to have your judgment on these matters. While they may not always agree with you, I think you have been one of the true friends of the Indian people and have tried in a very diligent way to get to the bottom of the problems fundamentally, and, as here today, suggest solutions that might be incorporated in legislative language.

So we will take a careful look at this after our testimony is concluded today and think about working with you in getting out some sort of legislative product.

Mr. YATES. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Mexico is here.

Mr. LUJAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to welcome you to this committee. I make plenty of appearances before your committee and always you are most courteous and very helpful.

Mr. YATES. I am glad to be on this side of the table with you, Mr. Lujan.

Mr. LUJAN. It seems that with your proposing something like this, we cannot lose, because if it does happen the way you are proposing, we get the necessary funds to do what is really necessary at the Albuquerque Indian School.

Mr. YATES. That is right. That is what is proposed. We have taken the first step which shows we are serious about trying to solve this question.

I know how very interested you have been over the years in trying to bring a solution to a very difficult question. I can understand the concerns of the Pueblo people for a return to the campus of IAIA. It is a beautiful campus. It has to be rehabilitated, too. But it seems to me that AIS in Albuquerque is more centrally located for the Pueblo people. It is in the center location for all of their tribes. I know that several of their tribes have disagreed with some of the others. I know that the Zuni Pueblos, for example,

believe that the IAIA should stay in Santa Fe. We think this is the best decision that should be made.

We are proposing a serious attempt to rehabilitate to an excellent condition the facilities at AIS.

Mr. LUJAN. I was just thinking, I grew up in Santa Fe, before the art school came in there. That whole campus was the Indian school for that area of the country. I am not too familiar with the Albuquerque school, although it was there for a long time, but during my growing up days we did not travel down to Albuquerque quite as easily as we do now.

I remember the Santa Fe Indian School being one of the large ones at that time.

Perhaps because of, I do not know, nostalgia or leaving things as they were, seeing them as they were at that time, that there was the desire on my part to see the high school part be brought back to Santa Fe. It was a very popular addition to the facilities.

Mr. YATES. That is what you testified to before my subcommittee. I can understand that viewpoint. But I think the proposal we are making is the best of all possible worlds. I think the Pueblo people will get a very good high school in Albuquerque, point one.

Point two, the Institute will begin to flourish in Pueblo country and also bring the benefits of Indian art and culture to that community.

Mr. LUJAN. I want to congratulate you. We have had many, many discussions on this. You have been very sincere, want to be helpful, do the best thing. Of course, you have settled in on this approach to it. I think you have handled it in a marvelous way. I really congratulate you for that.

Mr. YATES. Thank you very much.

Mr. LUJAN. I know of your sincerity in trying to bring about a good solution. Thank you very much.

Mr. YATES. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Chairman Yates, thank you very much.

Mr. YATES. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Our next witness is Deputy Under Secretary Darrell Knuffke, Department of the Interior.

[Prepared statement of Hon. Darrell Knuffke may be found in the appendix.]

STATEMENT OF HON. DARRELL KNUFFKE, DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ACCOMPANIED BY DR. EARL J. BARLOW, DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF INDIAN EDUCATION PROGRAMS, BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS, AND JON WADE, ACTING PRESIDENT, INSTITUTE OF AMERICAN INDIAN ARTS

Mr. KNUFFKE. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

With your permission, I will just supply my formal statement to the committee and simply summarize it for you and perhaps respond to questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, we will use that procedure.

Mr. KNUFFKE. We are pleased to have an opportunity to present our views on H.R. 6850, a bill to transfer operation of the Institute of American Indian Arts from the Office of Indian Education, BIA, to the Office of Indian Arts and Crafts Board.

The bill further provides that use of the Institute's Santa Fe campus by any other entity would be phased out over a 3-year period. Those two provisions, as we have heard Chairman Yates describe, refers to the decision made last year by the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs to allow the All-Indian Pueblo Council to transfer temporarily high school students from the Albuquerque Indian School, where many of the facilities are old and considered to be unsafe, to the Art Institute which at that time was running at much less than full capacity and had adequate empty space to house the high school students.

I believe it is the view of many people that a history of inconsistent guidance and inefficient management by the BIA allowed the Institute to deteriorate to the point that it was vulnerable to a group with a demonstrable need.

We certainly agree with the bill's sponsor, Congressman Yates, that some steps must be taken to insure that the past pattern of inefficiency and indirection is eliminated. Mr. Yates, as you have pointed out, has been one of the best friends the Institute has. I do not think it overstates the case at all to suggest there would be no Institute today but for his continued support. And in that assessment I include the interest and concern he has shown in recent months over the impact the joint use of the campus has had on the students, faculty, and administration, certainly on the very future of the Institute.

We wholeheartedly concur that the Institute must not only survive but must thrive, grow, and expand. We are committed to achieving expansion and excellence at the Art Institute and believe we can do so.

Unfortunately, we disagree with the approach the bill proposes and must therefore oppose it.

First, Mr. Chairman, we do not believe the bill is necessary. The Secretary already has the authority, under the reorganization plan No. 3 of 1950, to transfer the IAIA to any other departmental entity. But assuming the need to transfer the Institute, and we agree with that need, we strongly believe the Indian Arts and Crafts Board is not the proper place to lodge that authority.

I would like to give you a bit of background on the Institute and the Arts and Crafts Board to explain why we hold that view.

The Institute of American Indian Arts was created by the Secretary of the Interior in 1962. It was opened that year to 140 carefully recruited students in the 10th through 12th grades, and to a few post high-school students who took two postsecondary academic courses.

The Institute has, from the beginning been a progressive arts school which has encouraged its students to draw upon their cultural heritages while experimenting in nontraditional media as well as using traditional forms. The Institute's statement of philosophy sums up the purpose of this approach:

> The underlying philosophy of the program is that unique cultural tradition can be honored and can be used creatively as the springboard to a meaningful contemporary life. The Institute holds that cultural differences are a rich wellspring from which may be drawn new creative forces relevant to contemporary conditions and environments. We believe that, ultimately, by learning to link the best in Indian culture to contemporary life, the young Indian will be able to solve his own problems and enrich the world scene in the process.

That philosophy has governed the Institute since its inception. It has been inextricably and most appropriately bound to and involved with every other aspect of contemporary Indian life. Its emphasis, its focus, its directions, have been sensitive to shifts in the perceptions, aspirations, and frustrations of Indian people. The art it ultimately produces has reflected that, often with devastating accuracy and impact.

We believe much of that is due to the fact that the Institute of American Indian Art has been, since its inception, a part of Indian affairs programs in the Interior Department. We believe it is important that the Institute remain a part of the broader world of Indian affairs in the Department because it is a vital and interdependent part of that world.

The Indian Arts and Crafts Board was originally created for the very narrow purpose of helping Indians economically by expanding the market for their arts and crafts. It has done that important job well and continues to do it well today. But it is not a part of Indian Affairs and cannot feel as acutely the pressures, tensions, and changes in the Indian community. The Arts and Crafts Board has no programmatic functions similar to those of other agencies in the Department. It does not and, we believe, cannot operate schools, at least as presently constituted.

There is, we believe, a symbolic danger in such a relationship as H.R. 6850 proposes. Despite the problems the Institute has experienced, Mr. Chairman, it still enjoys a superb reputation in the art world. That, I think, is one of the most promising aspects of its future.

If it were to become subordinate to the Arts and Crafts Board, which is known mainly as a marketing board, I believe we would risk inviting the public perception that commercialization had somehow replaced artistic and cultural honesty and sensitivity. I do not for a moment suggest that such would actually be the case. I mean rather that, given the buffeting the Institute has already suffered, we should be alert to that danger.

Finally, placing the Institute under the Board would deprive it of the Indian leadership and guidance otherwise available to it through the Native American Council of Regents and the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs.

If it is true, as we believe, that the Institute derives much of its artistic vitality from its association with Indian Affairs, it is also true that its decline has occurred under the management of the BIA. The challenge, it seems to us, is to retain the one and reverse the other. Under Secretary James Joseph recently made a series of decisions which we believe will accomplish that goal.

First, he has directed that responsibility for the Institute be transferred from the Bureau of Indian Affairs to the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs. This, we believe, will give the Institute the attention, visibility and support within the Department it deserves. Implicit in this decision is the Under Secretary's commitment to the future of the Institute and that will be clear to those involved in decisions about its future.

We believe it is time to remove the Institute from the Bureau because the Institute is generally quite different from other BIA schools. It has never been compatible with them and probably

never will be. The Bureau has, over the years, shuffled authority for the Institute from the area office to the central office and back again. It has had five administrators in 2 years. It has never had the stability it needed over a sustained period of time. The wonder is not that it has suffered; the wonder is that it has survived.

That seems to reflect a lack of commitment over the years, perhaps a lack of interest, in the future of the Institute. We believe it is important now, practically as well as symbolically, to elevate the status of the Institute within the Department while we begin the work of stabilizing the school and providing for its sound long-term management.

Second, the Under Secretary has directed the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs to establish a small management team, using the resources of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Policy, Budget, and Administration; the Office of Indian Education; and the Native American Council of Regents to develop an efficient management strategy for the Institute.

Third, and we believe this is critical for the long-range future of the Institute, we will begin immediately to work with the Native American Council of Regents to clarify and strengthen the council's status so it can assume, to the extent possible, the functions normally associated with boards of regents in the management of postsecondary schools. Its status now is little more than advisory and it has long sought a change in that status.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, to resolve the present dispute over use of the campus, the Under Secretary has taken these actions. The All-Indian Pueblo Council needs safe, pleasant surroundings for its students and understandably wants them very badly. We will seek the immediate renovation of the Albuquerque Indian school so the Pueblo students can be returned there as soon as possible and so the Santa Fe campus can be restored to the use of the Institute.

Meanwhile, the Pueblo high school students will remain at Santa Fe for what we hope will be no more than 2 years. We believe we can accelerate that rehabilitation program and accomplish it in 2 years. During that time, the Under Secretary has directed that the president of the Institute will have full authority for the Santa Fe campus to eliminate many of the tensions which now stem from shared administration.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, we are committed to the preservation and growth of the Institute. We believe the steps outlined here will achieve that and we look forward to working with the committee to that end.

That pretty much summarizes my statement. I will be happy to try to answer any questions you might have. I have with me Dr. Earl Barlow, director of the Office of Indian Education under whose institution the Art Institute is directed. Also, Jon Wade, acting president, IAIA. They are both here.

The CHAIRMAN. Happy to have you all.

Mr. Lujan?

Mr. LUJAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, leaving aside the fact that all this is happening in my backyard and any provincial views that I have, let me explore with you.

Why the insistence of using this magnificent facility for such a very limited number of students? It would seem to make sense that this be one of the departments under the Southwest Indian Polytechnical Institute or Haskell or some institution like that, even for 300 students, let us say, when it could very well be accommodated under some other institution rather than an institution all by itself.

What is the reason for that?

Mr. KNUFFKE. To answer the first part of your question regarding insistence on using it for a limited number of students, first of all, we hope that does not remain the case very much longer. There is an energetic recruitment program underway now. We hope to have it up to something near its capacity.

Despite all the problems it has encountered with changes of signals, joint use of the campus, all the attendant rumors that the Institute was about to vanish in thin air, recruitment has actually improved, the number of students has continued to increase over the years. We hope to continue and expand that effort.

We explored, in the task force, moving to either Haskell Junior College in Kansas or SIPI. The problem with Haskell, which seems otherwise to have the space to do the job, is really one of location. It seems everybody we have talked to that has sensitivity to arts and artists, that Santa Fe is unique in this world in terms of the art community. The atmosphere is very important to the training of artists.

The community has embraced the Institute. They support each other in any number of ways. SIPI, Southwest Poly, in Albuquerque is itself finally beginning to get on track, to grow and to expand. It has no facilities there now that can be readily made available for the training of art students.

And we further thought since that Institute in Albuquerque seems to be solving its problems, that it was a little bit pointless to visit this controversy on yet a third Institution. We have two in turmoil now. We would like to resolve it on that basis.

Mr. LUJAN. Speaking of SIPI, it has kind of been my observation that it, too, has been underutilized.

Mr. KNUFFKE. That is a fact.

Mr. LUJAN. So if that is underutilized, the Santa Fe campus is underutilized, joining them together would make business sense, make for more efficient operation.

I really hate to be on this side of the argument because certainly one would like to preserve both institutions. I support both the Albuquerque Indian School and the art school in Santa Fe and SIPI and Haskell. But which is the best way to accomplish the good education and yet within reasonable budgetary measures when you have the two underutilized.

It would just make a lot of sense to put the two of them together. It seems as though the struggle is for who is going to operate this, who is going to control it, just looking out after one's turf, rather than making a really top-rate institution of both of them. It bothers me that we have had all of the problems that we have had at SIPI and perhaps bringing this into that institution might help bolster it up.

Mr. KNUFFKE. As I say, we are fairly confident that SIPI is on its way to better utilizing the space that it has. Within the next couple of years we are told by people who operate that institution it will be running pretty much at full capacity.

Mr. LUJAN. I am not criticizing it. I am just saying that we hear that all the time. Now one of the things that is said, in spite of the fact that students were being moved from Albuquerque to Santa Fe, Santa Fe has still continued to increase. That is not really correct because the reason that we are talking about bringing students from Albuquerque to Santa Fe was because of the underutilization. It was down way before there was any talk of it.

Mr. KNUFFKE. Certainly. If I left that impression, let me clarify now. It was running at about a third its capacity, and that is certainly unconscionable.

We do not suggest that the Art Institute ought to be relieved of any standards of efficiency. I think we do suggest, however, sir, that it makes some sense to evaluate it on a somewhat different basis from the standards that we use for other educational institutions. It is a different creature, which is one of the reasons we support moving it from the BIA's Office of Indian Education to the Office of the Assistant Secretary.

What I intended to convey with that was that despite the fact that it has been buffeted on all sides over a number of years, despite the tensions which emerged from that joint occupation in the span of the last year, it has managed to increase its enrollment. I was not trying to make excuses for its performance over the last decade.

Mr. LUJAN. I am glad this whole problem came up because as I told Chairman Yates, we cannot lose. Is the Department of the Interior totally committed to the $7.5 million to the Albuquerque facility?

Mr. KNUFFKE. Absolutely committed, sir, yes.

Mr. LUJAN. So if this were to go on, then we would—I do not think that is the ideal solution, let me tell you, but at least one way or the other we have got to have an institution that can function. Albuquerque Indian School, it is just terrible the condition it is in.

Mr. KNUFFKE. That is perfectly true. Chairman Lovato has taken me through it. I understand their concerns. That is one of the difficult decisions. Assistant Secretary Gerard was faced on the one hand with parents who desperately want and need facilities for their children. He was faced on the other hand with an Institute which has been neglected, to be sure, over the years which despite that fact continues to be vital, continues to be thought valuable by the Indian community, and I think people who are interested in art generally, not just here but abroad.

The decision he made, it might have been difficult to do otherwise. We think there is a resolution of that.

Mr. LUJAN. I do not find that widespread support that you are talking about, to be very honest with you, among my constituency who should be the ones that really would be beating the tub for it. I do not find that enthusiasm. I find the enthusiasm for the Albuquerque Indian School.

Mr. KNUFFKE. During the public meetings that we held in Santa Fe through the task force, we had any number of folks from the community who were there to express their continued support for the Institute.

Mr. LUJAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Lujan. We appreciate your coming this morning.

Mr. KNUFFKE. Thank you for the opportunity.

The CHAIRMAN. We will now hear from Mr. Delfin Lovato of the All-Indian Pueblo Council.

[Prepared statements of Delfin J. Lovato and Alvino Lucero may be found in the appendix.]

PANEL CONSISTING OF: DELFIN J. LOVATO, CHAIRMAN, ALL INDIAN PUEBLO COUNCIL; BENNY STARR, REPRESENTING SANTO DOMINGO PUEBLO; ALVINO LUCERO, REPRESENTING ISLETA PUEBLO; PAUL BERNAL, REPRESENTING ALL-INDIAN PUEBLO COUNCIL; AND PAUL TAFOYA, REPRESENTING SANTA CLARA PUEBLO

Mr. LOVATO. Mr. Chairman, I have several members from the Pueblo community who would like to present testimony as a panel.

The CHAIRMAN. We will be glad to have them and you can proceed with whatever order you like.

Mr. LOVATO. Mr. Chairman, permit me to introduce members of our delegation here.

To my left is Governor Paul Tafoya of Santa Clara Pueblo; to my immediate left, Mr. Paul Bernal, representing the All-Indian Pueblo Council; to his left, Alvino Lucero of the Isleta Pueblo; and on the far right, Mr. Benny Starr, representing the Pueblo Santo Domingo.

I have here, Mr. Chairman, several documents that I would like to have introduced for the record.

The CHAIRMAN. We would be pleased to have them.

Mr. LOVATO. We have a resolution from the National Congress of American Indians representing approximately 151 tribes. We also have a resolution from the National Tribal Chairmen's Association who represent the various tribal chairmen, federally recognized tribes in this country. We also have numerous other resolutions from other tribes throughout the country basically supporting the position of the Pueblo tribes. We would like to have all of these documents introduced as part of our record.

The CHAIRMAN. We will place those documents in the committee's files.

Mr. LOVATO. I will briefly summarize my statement.

I think it is important to note here, Mr. Chairman, that despite several years and decades of what I thought was the end of a paternalistic type of attitude on the part of the Department of the Interior, we seem to be in that same position today. I think the manner in which this entire situation has been handled reflects that attitude.

We have been asked here today, or it has been recommended, constantly being said, that this is what the Indian community wants. We dispute that, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee. Nine resolutions which we have introduced here reflect

that. The recommendations of the task force that were brought up by Mr. Yates and also by the Department do not reflect the recommendations of the task force.

I am a member of that task force. We have another member representing the National Congress who sits on that task force. That does not reflect the recommendations of the task force.

Let me speak to the bill before the committee, sir. We are opposed to H.R. 6850. We do not feel that the Arts and Crafts Board is in any position or certainly has not demonstrated the ability to be involved in the operation or administration of an educational facility.

We feel also that H.R. 6850 would basically legislate a solution to the problem in Santa Fe. It would basically deny in our opinion the use of that facility for the education of Pueblo, Apache, Ute, and Navajo children who are attending that school now.

We have approximately 50 secondary students there now. Approximately 4 years ago we contracted the operation of the Albuquerque Indian School under the Self-Determination and Educational Assistance Act. We have been running that institution for the past 4 years. We have demonstrated beyond a doubt our ability to run our own high school program. We would like to see that program expanded.

I think we need to look at the facilities in Santa Fe from several points of view. No. 1, up until 1962 the facility was basically for the New Mexico area tribes. It was a high school program, it was a good program. But what basically happened is in the late fifties there was a policy toward assimilating our children into the public school system.

As a result, by 1962 we were forced to close down the high school program. There was strong objection from the Pueblo people. But despite that objection they started what is now known as the Institute of American Indian Arts.

To look at the 18-year history of that facility, sir, I think it has already been brought out here—we have a copy of the Office of Inspector General's audit report. They point out glaring discrepancies and deficiencies in the operation and administration of that school.

But I think even deeper than that, sir, and members of this committee, it is important to bring out one point which everyone seems to miss. We are talking about Indian art and culture, we are talking about something that we represent, something that has been in our opinion to some extent exploited by that Institute.

We do not like the type of art that is being produced there. These people here and gentlemen here will testify to it. Yes, it is in the heart of Indian country, it is in the heart of Pueblo country. We have a right to that facility. The Institute has never had more than 250 students at its peak, sir. The interest in the Indian community is that the Pueblo people be given the opportunity to utilize that facility to expand their educational programs.

The per pupil cost at that school right now is in excess of $18,000 per student. How can you justify that type of expenditure? You can send a child to the best art schools in this country for that kind of money.

We are talking this year alone about 114 students starting the school year. At one point there were less than 100 students in a school built for 500 kids. That school was built with many facilities unused that were laying in mothballs, two dormitories not even being used, kitchen facilities basically laying idle.

This is the type of situation we are talking about. It is just perturbing to see some bureaucrat 2,000 miles away making decisions based on, I think, a lot of emotionalism and love for art, which is fine, but without taking into consideration the cold, basic facts that we have here.

SIPI is in the same situation. We have a tremendously high per pupil cost, probably close to $15,000 per student. Haskell is in the same condition.

The Pueblo people of all the Indian tribes in this country have an avid love for art and culture, but we believe that can best be taught in our own communities. In our high school we have a basic art education. We are certainly not spending no $18,000 per student. We do not think it is proper. It is wasteful. The grassroots support for such a facility is not there, it does not exist.

We have continually said if there is need for such a facility, who can best say we need such a facility other than the Indian people. The Indian people have taken the position, why should an Alaskan go all the way to Santa Fe, N. Mex., to learn art? Why should someone from the Northwest go to Albuquerque?

We have supported the idea that the role of the Federal Government and Congress in the field of Indian art and culture ought to be limited to one of art education and providing financial support and assistance to the tribes directly rather than through institutionalizing something we consider dear and vital to the Pueblo culture and tradition.

We have even suggested that if the Institute were to be relocated, I think the Pueblo people would not mind at all, even if it was to be moved to Kansas.

What we are saying here, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, is that aside from all of the emotional arguments, just picking the facts on their face and taking a look at what it is doing to the Pueblo communities, one cannot come to any other conclusion but to move the Institute of American Indian Arts to the Albuquerque campus, supplement that secondary program and allow the Pueblo people to continue their efforts at self-determination in the education of their children.

The Albuquerque campus, despite the comments made here, is totally inadequate and inappropriate for a high school program. We have facts right now which will be presented to the committee which will show you that its location has been adverse to the welfare of our kids. It has been the scene of everything from murders to break-ins. It is located in the heart of Albuquerque. We have had tremendous problems there, as the city of Albuquerque can testify to. It is not a proper location for such a program.

We cannot support such a move and I think the position of my Pueblo leadership at the present time is that we have no intentions of moving from Santa Fe despite what the Under Secretary has just reported.

I would like at this time, Mr. Chairman, to give my Pueblo governors an opportunity to speak.

The CHAIRMAN. We are glad to hear from them.

Mr. LOVATO. This is Mr. Benny Starr.

Mr. STARR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, the Santo Domingo Tribe submitted their statement. However, I am glad to be here and want to reiterate my tribal council's view on this matter.

I am one of the tribal spokesmen for Santo Domingo. I am also the chairman of the five tribes in New Mexico on education, which represents Cochiti, Santo Domingo, San Felipe, Santa Ana, and Sandia.

It is a documented fact that our children are not receiving the best possible education in the institutions that they are in now, the public schools. I attended the Santa Fe Indian School at the time it was a high school from 1935 to 1942, graduated high school there.

I know what Santa Fe Indian School can do for us educationally. I think we need to look at education, the most important activity for our Indian children, then look at art students. There may be 1 out of 100 that will be successful in the art area. What about the other 22,000 kids that want an academic education? Are we going to deny those students for the sake of one that is going to succeed in art?

My youngest child is eight. She knows art, she knows craft, because that is my responsibility, to teach my children as they grow in arts and crafts.

What I would like to see is academic education for my children so that they can survive, so that they can live on an equal basis with the rest of society. I think this is an important part that we need to look at, the academic side. Certainly, if other people wish to have arts and crafts for different parts of the country, why don't they set up an institution in their locale?

Santa Fe is Pueblo country. It has been stated that you are going to help us preserve Indian culture. How are you going to help us preserve Indian culture? By exploitation?

Santo Domingo is considered to be one of the most conservative of all tribes. We don't allow picture taking, we don't allow sketching. I think we can preserve our own.

Some of the students from the Institute come into our community during the ceremonies and they have put on canvass what they see at Santo Domingo. Those are some things given to us from time immemorial, something for us to exercise, a privilege with the language, with the culture, which has preserved Santo Domingo as a tribe.

We don't like what is happening from some of those students. We want to hold on to our culture. Let us preserve our own culture, not somebody from Washington, not somebody from the Interior. I think we know what we want. We should have that right to practice our religion, our culture. I think we have that right as a citizen of the United States.

We want the best for our children. I have eight children. I want the best possible academic education for my children. I think it is irresponsible on the part of the Department of the Interior to take

a lot of money, put it into the Art Institute while, on the other hand, our children attending academic schools are not given those benefits.

We have tried to better our program, to bring about an innovative program. I work with those kids on a daily basis, being the chairman, from the Head Start, elementary, secondary, and post-secondary. That is part of my responsibility. I know what is happening. It is living proof that only a handful is benefiting by the Art Institute in Santa Fe.

We want an academic program. I think we should have the privilege to decide for ourselves what we need, what we want, and I think we are going to stay in Santa Fe to get our academic education for our children.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman

Mr. LOVATO. Governor Alvino Lucero will be the next witness.

Mr. LUCERO. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, thank you for giving me the opportunity this morning to appear before you. I have a prepared statement, also, from the Pueblo of Isleta. But I will not read that. I will go through some of the thoughts that I have regarding H.R. 6850.

We realize that IAIA has been there for the past 18 years and some of the statements that have been made here this morning are being said that IAIA can still come up and flourish and do the things it was intended to do.

But my belief is that if it was going to do that, it had an opportunity the past 18 years to accomplish that particular thing which I do not believe giving it a couple of more years will do it.

We have documented reports of the student ratio with teachers which is in many cases 1 on 1, 1 to 5, which I think is way beyond any proper expenditures that should be made to educate a child.

We have other schools that are in need of financial aid. Some of the programs that we do run, title IV, title I, JOM, those funds are being cut and yet we are seeing $18,000 per student at IAIA. The $3½ million being talked about to renovate AIS I believe should be spent for better purposes than what it is intended for.

We already have facilities at IAIA, at the Santa Fe Indian School, which I must say now that I do not believe that the Pueblo leadership will give up the Santa Fe Indian School.

We have another bill which we have testified on, H.R. 2166, and that one gets into a little more deeper what H.R. 6850 is doing.

As has been stated here, I believe that the culture that we have, our teacnings, our beliefs, our language, our music, our songs, belong within the Pueblo communities. It is up to us as parents of our children to teach them our way of life. I don't believe they have to go to any institute to be taught our way of life. We were taught by our grandfathers, our parents. We hold this very dear within our hearts. I am not about to allow anyone to institutionalize my culture, my music, my songs, my religion, or anything else.

I do not think that transferring the responsibility from the Secretary to the Board is the proper thing to do. I do not think that the Board is capable of making decisions for the Pueblo leaders as to how that school should run.

We, as tribal leaders, as parents of students, know what we need and want for our children.

As I put in my statement, if the Indian people are to self-determine themselves under H.R. 3868, let it be so. Don't give us a self-determination bill, turn right around and tell us what to do. It is wasted effort if this is to be done.

I don't feel like the two schools can do right because the high school students and the postsecondary students are mingling and are not getting along. We are going to have something drastic that will happen there if something is not done, and I don't believe that this is the type of thing that the Pueblo leaders want.

We have talked this over within the Isleta Tribal Council and the council's's desire is that our students stay with the Santa Fe Indian School. Come this September, come next September, the following September and from here on out, we will stand to where we will remain at the Santa Fe Institute.

Thank you very much for giving me this opportunity.

Mr. LOVATO. Mr. Paul Bernal will be next.

Mr. BERNAL. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much for the opportunity.

I would like to make this brief statement for your records.

My colleagues have spoken strongly about their feelings, about the Art Institute in Santa Fe, N. Mex.

First, I point out to you that we, the Pueblo Indians, have never drifted from one reservation to another. We always occupied the community where we have been born. Our elders are still there and our history and our religious practices still remain as they were from the beginning of time.

These are the things that we wanted to have protected by this Government. The U.S. Government has the responsibility in our behalf, the natives of this country.

Under the Constitution of the United States, it says we have our freedom, we have our protection. We want to exercise that particular thing, when it says due process, in the right manner in which it is intended, the definition of that particular thing. That is the reason why we sacrificed all this time. Something the U.S. Government gave to us, we are going to keep. We are not going to give it up.

We want to inform this committee, Mr. Chairman, that they should help us, assist us, to do our own preservation of our Indian religion. That is what we came here for. I think H.R. 6850 is wrong. We strongly believe it is wrong. We don't accept that. We want to oppose that. We don't go around in other Indian communities throughout the United States and try to be a copycat. We don't do that.

We have in our own community our religious songs, stories, costumes, dances. We make crafts, what have you. We are born with this talent. The great spirit gives us that talent. It is a great gift to us Pueblo people. We admire it. We don't want duplications. We don't believe in doing it that way. We don't want to make any mistake by misrepresenting those things like some other natives are doing.

We would like to inform you, Mr. Chairman, that the first time in the history, after the Santa Fe Indian School has been closed down by the bureaucracy, we had a graduation exercise this spring. Our Indian students, the young men and young women who are

going through the Santa Fe Indian School, are graduating. We are going to continue to do that in years to come. We want you to know this. It is a reality, it is what we are going through, Mr. Chairman.

We want to get that institution strengthened. The Santa Fe Indian School belongs to the Pueblos. We want no bureaucrat to make it that we are going to move the public students back to the Indian school, no way. We want Mr. Jim Joseph to know that we don't like his decision.

Mr. Chairman, religion is the most important thing in our life, our culture and religion, our culture and tradition. We believe in preservation. What God gave to us we don't duplicate, we enjoy it. We want to exercise those gifts, we want to keep it that way.

We want you to know that we are the Pueblo people, consisting of 19 Pueblos. Why is it that we have disunity? Maybe I might be offending Mr. Bob Lewis. His students from the Pueblo Zuni are 24 in normal with the Santa Fe Indian School. I do think the Pueblo unity is gone and I think the public consensus of the organization is represented right here. If, from here on, we could speak with one voice.

Thank you for this opportunity.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Mr. TAFOYA. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Paul Tafoya. I am Governor of the Santa Clara Pueblo Indian Tribe.

I would like to reemphasize a point, that among the Pueblo people the culture is taught within the homes and we emphasize very strongly this family relationship that we have insofar as art or the overall culture values are instructed.

We teach our young people the values of the arts and crafts. At the same time we show them how it is connected with the religious activities and in what respect. So we are not taking our arts and crafts institutions lightly. It is quite deep as far as the Pueblo people are concerned.

I also point out to you that the location of the present Albuquerque Indian School is almost centrally located now within the city of Albuquerque. That is absolutely no place for a school of that type. The campus is small, the traffic is heavy. As the chairman of the Pueblo Council pointed out to you, crime is increasing in that area and we have great concern for our young Indian people there.

I would like to point out something else, too, that the time when SIPI was opened it was my understanding that that school was constructed at a cost of $13 million. There is no possible way that you could renovate the Albuquerque Indian School. The only thing that I think can be done now would be to relocate the school and come up with a brand new facility.

But some years back when they constructed the SIPI facility at an estimated cost of $13 million, I would imagine that to construct a new school for high school students would be somewhere around $20 million. Then that concerns me.

The Pueblos' priorities, what about the Santa Clara Pueblo Indian School that we have? We are not interested in renovating our school, our present school. We want a brandnew school. We want to contract the school under the Indian Self-Determination

73-176 O—81—3

and Educational Assistance Act. We want that school. We can't do it.

So that is very important that we have other priorities that we are concerned with insofar as education is concerned.

I would like to also stress the point that the academic skills are important today and we need to provide the basic educational instructions for our young students. We need doctors, we need lawyers, and we need scientists. In every business profession we need this input from the Indian communities.

So you can see how we feel about Indian art versus the primary education that our students need. We weigh the difference and what do we have? The primary educational needs are high, they are heavy.

I ask you, as members of this committee, to vote against H.R. 6850. We are in opposition to it.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, sir. We thank you.

Mr. Lovato?

Mr. LOVATO. I just want to conclude by pointing out it is pretty evident, I think, that the vast majority of the Indian tribes in this country as evidenced by the resolutions we have introduced support our position in principle, in concept, and I think for whatever reason the administration has totally refused to take that into consideration. Maybe that is not surprising.

But the point here is that the Indian people themselves, at least the vast majority of them, have spoken. If the voice of Indian people means anything at all, sir, members of this committee, I think it is saying that art is fine, maybe there needs to be an institute, but what they are saying also is that what the Pueblo people are trying to do through their high school program is more important.

And when we look at the facts, the attitude of the Pueblo community is such that if the Institute remains where it is, I do not feel it is conducive to a good art program. The attitude in my communities is such, sir, that they are turned off to the Institute and the longer this dilemma continues, the worse it is going to get.

We have no intentions of moving our children. We intend to stay in Santa Fe. If they want to spend $7 million, I think they are wasting their time because that facility in Santa Fe belongs to us, we want to stay there. We think we have a justification for our facility, and for whatever reason and whatever justification the administration has decided this on is beyond us because the Indian people have spoken. The vast majority of them have supported our position. And no doubt they will continue to support that.

We have to live there, Mr. Chairman and members of this committee, that is our home. This administration comes and goes. I just hope we can come to some resolution to this very important problem.

That concludes my statement, Mr. Chairman. We are willing to answer any questions.

The CHAIRMAN. We understand your position.

Mr. Lujan?

Mr. LUJAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just some questions to clear up some of the testimony.

Part of the testimony is that Albuquerque is the ideal location for the Albuquerque Indian School. Gentlemen, graphically, when you look at all the Pueblos, does it not make more sense for it to be in Santa Fe? It is closer to most of the homes of the kids going to school from the Pueblos with the exception of Zuni, Yakima, maybe Isleta. But certainly Santo Domingo—Santa Fe would be the more central location.

Mr. LOVATO. Yes.

Mr. LUJAN. Also, there has been testimony that there is a lot of support for the school remaining in Santa Fe, that at the hearings—I am sorry I was not there—I have not found a lot of support. I am not criticizing it but I have not found a lot of support. What kind of support did you find in Albuquerque at the hearings for the Institute to stay in Santa Fe?

Mr. LOVATO. The support does not exist, Congressman. There have been a few artists who obviously, for obvious reasons, would like to preserve art in this location. We do not agree with the fact that the Institute can only flourish in Santa Fe. I think there is a lot of other locations for it.

We are talking about a commonsense approach to this thing. I do not find the support. I don't see it. I have talked to tribal governments across this country. As vice president of NCAI, we belong to the National Tribal Chairmen. It is not there.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Tafoya mentioned about the cost of SIPI. Do you think $7.5 million will take care of the needs of Albuquerque?

Mr. LOVATO. Absolutely not. And I think the figures that were put together were done in 1979. I think with inflation and everything else—I don't know what kind of renovation they are talking about. They haven't talked to us about our needs. They haven't talked to our school board and our school board represents the Mescalero, Jicarilla, and Navajo Tribe, also.

Mr. LUJAN. One final thing. Running throughout the testimony of all four of you has been that we are not going to move. You have the high school grades in Santa Fe now, 1 to 8 in Albuquerque. Your intention is to move the 1 through 8 to Santa Fe also?

Mr. LOVATO. Our intention is to move the ninth grade class over there. Let me point out briefly, we have four vacant classrooms on the Albuquerque campus, just sitting there, temporary buildings. We want to move those classrooms to the Santa Fe campus so everyone there would have better classroom space. The administration orders us to stop.

Mr. LUJAN. Do you mean they are portable buildings?

Mr. LOVATO. Yes. Both our high school program as well as the Art Institute is in dire need of classrooms. We wanted to move them. The administration tells us no, for whatever reason I do not know. They are just sitting in Albuquerque collecting dust.

Mr. LUJAN. You say you are not going to move. What happens if you do not move and they say, you move?

Mr. LOVATO. I think in November we might have something to say about that. A lot of other things could happen. We certainly do not intend to give up the fight. It has only begun as far as we are concerned.

Mr. TAFOYA. Mr. Lujan, we consider art as a vocation, and we feel that we already have a vocational school at SIPI. We feel that

the art school should be moved to Albuquerque at the SIPI facility, leaving the Santa Fe school open for our high school program.

I think if we think about the old Albuquerque Indian School, and if we are now thinking about renovating a school, we are thinking about wasting an awful lot of money because eventually the school will phase out, out of that location. That is just not the proper place for it.

Mr. LUJAN. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you gentlemen. We appreciate your being with us today.

We will now hear from Ella Mae Horse from the NCAI.

[Prepared statement of Ella Mae Horse may be found in the appendix.]

STATEMENT OF ELLA MAE HORSE, OFFICER, NATIONAL CONGRESS OF AMERICAN INDIANS

Ms. HORSE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to request that Mr. Lovato remain at the table to sit with me. He outranks me on the NCI board and we also served on the advisory committee.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, thank you for the opportunity to present the views of the National Congress of American Indians on the bill, H.R. 6850, relating to the Institute of American Indian Arts.

I am Ella Mae Horse, an officer of the National Congress of American Indians and a member of the Interior Department's Advisory Committee on American Indian Art and Culture.

Mr. Chairman, NCAI has gone on record on several occasions on matters relating to the Sante Fe facility.

Most recently, NCAI passed Resolution 80-94 relating to S. 2166, the Native American Culture and Art Development Act. NCAI requested, among other things, funds for the construction of a first-rate art institute at a location to be determined by the Indian people and administered in the same manner.

I realize that the Senate bill is not under consideration here today, but I hope that the resolution relating to it will be placed in the hearing record inasmuch as it relates to the Art Institute and the education of the Pueblo children.

Mr. Chairman, we have no problem with the findings of the Congress as set forth in H.R. 6850. We especially agree that the United States owes a responsibility of trust to the tribes of the American Indian and the members thereof, and it is in this light that we must oppose the bill.

H.R. 6850 places a priority on the preservation and development of Indian art without due consideration to the concerns of the Pueblo tribal governments who are principally affected by the legislation.

As pointed out earlier, NCAI supports the construction of a first-rate art institute and would assist with seeking adequate funds for such a facility. But an overriding issue of Pueblo tribal input and control over the educational and service programs directly affecting their tribal welfare is not addressed in H.R. 6850.

As stated in Resolution 80-94, NCAI supports this principle and supports the efforts of the Pueblo tribal governments in providing basic education for their children at the Santa Fe campus.

Further, Mr. Chairman, I am not at all certain that transferring the administration of the art program to the Indian Arts and Crafts Board, an operation that needs oversight itself, would not add to the administrative problems that already burden the program.

When the Interior Department's Advisory Committee on American Indian Art and Culture met at Santa Fe on March 8, it unanimously approved a resolution containing the following points:

The Advisory Committee is on record as supporting both programs—the Art Institute and the Santa Fe Indian School;

The committee is on record as supporting the construction of a first-rate art facility in a location and a place to be determined through consultation with Indian artists and Indian tribal governments;

In the interim, the administrators of the Santa Fe Indian School and Institute of American Indian Art be directed to develop alternatives which would best accommodate both programs in an atmosphere of cooperation and respect for one another.

If this is not the answer, it is a step in the right direction. Please be assured that NCAI stands ready to work with all concerned to resolve this situation to the best interests of the Pueblo tribal governments and the talented art students.

Thank you.

Mr. LUJAN. Thank you very much.

Do you have a copy of that resolution 80-94?

Ms. HORSE. Yes.

Mr. LUJAN. Without objection, we will include it in the record.

[Resolution 80-94 may be found in the appendix following the prepared statement of Ella Mae Horse.]

Mr. LUJAN. It is interesting that the Advisory Committee on American Indian Art and Culture in Santa Fe on March 8 stated what we are doing now, yet it seems like the Department is backing away from the recommendation of their own advisory committee. Do you see it that way?

Ms. HORSE. Yes. We just received a draft report a couple of weeks ago. I got it a couple of days before the deadline was due on comments. We had requested also the advisory committee when we met in Santa Fe, that we would have another opportunity to meet to review and comment together on the report. We have not been given that opportunity.

Mr. LUJAN. I am concerned about the solution. I know what we ought to do. I think that Santa Fe facility ought to be utilized locally. The problem I have not been able to resolve in my own mind is what we do with the Institute.

Does the National Congress of American Indians have a position on that, other than this recommendation that they could exist at the same facility? I do not think that is probably the right answer forever.

Ms. HORSE. What we supported is a new art school, at a location to be determined by the tribes.

Mr. LUJAN. What about moving it into SIPI or the department at Haskell as some have suggested? Would that work, or not?

Mr. LOVATO. I think it would work. I do not think you are going to see a program that is going to be no more than probably 150 to 200 students at any given time. The turnover rate is tremendous.

The fact of the matter is that while it is a good concept, a national art institute, who is going to argue against it? We certainly don't. What we are saying is it just doesn't make sense in a high school facility, it just doesn't. Even the artists complain about the poor facilities they have there. It is not an art school, never meant to be an art school. That is what we told the administration.

In the testimony here, Mr. Chairman, this reflects the position and recommendations of the advisory committee and not—it does not—the report given by the administration is no reflection of the position of the advisory council.

I would ask that the record be held open so—I have talked to the majority of the advisory board members who totally disagree with the recommendations and the action of the administration with regard to the school. We would like to submit those for the record.

Mr. LUJAN. We will hold the record open for 30 days. Is that enough time?

Mr. LOVATO. Yes, sir.

Mr. LUJAN. You know any institution cannot survive in a hostile atmosphere. To continue to push it seems counterproductive, really, in my mind.

Now when the Institute was established, it was established within the Department. It is not through legislation that specifies that it must be in Santa Fe. So that even if they moved it to the Arts and Crafts Board, that still does not mean that it has to remain in Santa Fe, does it?

Mr. LOVATO. No.

Mr. LUJAN. Even if this bill were to pass, the change could still be made if we found a better way to do it.

Mr. LOVATO. Mr. Chairman, I do not think where it stands administratively within the Department makes any difference. What we are talking about here is to place it in a postsecondary institution. It is a postsecondary program, small enough to fit in Haskell or SIPI.

I think we are even willing to take this matter before the Indian leadership of this country and ask them, do you even want an art school? If so, where, how do we run it, administer it? Not the way it is being done now.

The administration is making all the decisions, irrespective of the decision of tribal governments. They are going to decide who sits on the Board. By the way, there are no New Mexicans on that Board. That is moot at this point.

What we are saying is, listen to us. You are asking us what our priorities are, we are telling them, they don't listen. They are still intent on doing their own thing.

Mr. LUJAN. Thank you very much for your testimony. Governor Lewis is next.

[Prepared statement of Robert E. Lewis may be found in the appendix.]

STATEMENT OF ROBERT E. LEWIS, GOVERNOR, PUEBLO OF ZUNI

Mr. LEWIS. Yes, sir. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

For the record, I would like to read my statement, if I may.

Mr. LUJAN. You may proceed, Governor.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, first let me express the appreciation of the Zuni Tribal Council to you for time given me to present testimony in their behalf regarding H.R. 6850.

The Zuni Tribal Council wishes to emphasize the following points in today's testimony:

One, management and policy development relating to the future operation of the Institute of American Indian Arts.

Two, transfer of powers and responsibility from the Bureau of Indian Affairs to the Indian Arts and Crafts Board.

Three, future appropriations for the Institute of American Indian Arts.

Four, occupation at the Santa Fe campus by other entities.

Five, accreditation of the Institute of American Indian Arts.

We have reviewed other testimony on H.R. 6850 and find these areas needing further clarification.

The Zuni Tribal Council believes that H.R. 6850 is very progressive in that it legally establishes the Institute of American Indian Arts, and is a sincere attempt to deal with the many administrative and related problems that the Institute has faced since its establishment.

H.R. 6850 recognizes that native American cultures have greatly contributed to the cultural richness of American society.

H.R. 6850 recognizes that the U.S. Government owes a trust responsibility to American Indian tribes and that point of this trust responsibility includes assisting to preserve and develop American Indian art.

H.R. 6850 recognizes that the Institute of American Indian Arts has been mismanaged and neglected, and the BIA has therefore failed to accomplish its responsibility to properly administer, maintain, and operate the Institute.

One, management and policy development relating to the future operation of the Institute of American Indian Arts.

(a) H.R. 6850 does not adequately specify the role of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board for what standards they will use to effectively administer the IAIA program. We are not sure that this organization has the capability timewise for carrying out this responsibility.

(b) There needs to be a more definitive description of the membership of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board.

We recommend that a governing body must be appointed expressly for the purpose of providing policy direction and overall supervision for the IAIA. It is our fear that a board comprised of people who have other responsibilities will not devote the full time necessary for such issues as:

Reorganization and transition from the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for the program improvement and evaluation that is essential if the IAIA is to fulfill its responsibility to its students.

The description of the Board, its composition and role as it relates to the overall purposes of the Institute of American Indian Arts must be clarified.

Two, transfer of powers and responsibility from Bureau of Indian Affairs to the Indian Arts and Crafts Board.

Section 4 of H.R. 6850 addresses the transfer of administrative powers, responsibility, and performance of all functions of the IAIA from the Bureau of Indian Affairs to the Indian Arts and Crafts Board. This section raises several important questions regarding such transfer:

(a) How long will the transfer of administrative powers and responsibilities for all functions take?

(b) What procedural steps will be taken to insure that transfer of administrative powers and responsibilities for all functions assure improved administration and management?

(c) Is a transitional period being contemplated for orderly transfer of powers and responsibility?

(d) And what is the time frame for transition?

The transfer of administrative powers and responsibilities for all functions implies that moneys will be available for the operation of all functions of the Institute of American Indian Arts. H.R. 6850 does not specify what appropriation will be provided for the maintenance and improvement of total operations. The Zuni Tribal Council recommends that the above-questioned areas and appropriation of funds for future operations be addressed and clarified.

Three, occupation of Santa Fe campus by other entities.

Section 4 also addresses the issue of occupation of the Santa Fe campus. Although we feel that the IAIA's continued occupation of the Santa Fe campus is acceptable, there are practical as well as political considerations that must be addressed. These arise out of the fact that the Santa Fe Indian School is an educational entity of the All-Indian Pueblo Council.

The Zuni Tribal Council is very concerned that adequate consideration, procedure, and assurances are not evident in section 4 and therefore proposes the following recommendations for inclusion in this section as related to occupancy of the campus by other entities.

(a) All entities affected by section 4 must be involved and consulted in clarifying this section.

(b) There must be further meetings and hearings regarding the many practical problems that will occur through phaseout of the Santa Fe Indian School. Their meetings/hearings must involve all affected Pueblos and tribes.

(c) If other entities are to be phased out, there must be assurances of adequate funding, facilities and space elsewhere for their occupancy.

(d) A clearly defined plan for phaseout of occupany related to other entities must be developed.

Four, the final point the Zuni Tribal Council wishes to address in this testimony is the issue of accreditation of the Institute of American Indian Arts.

We strongly believe that the Institute must be accredited. A great deal of commitment, money, and effort is being expended by Congress in order to establish a first-rate national institute which will assist in the preservation and continued development of

American Indian arts. A great deal of time, energy, and talent is also spent by students participating in the program.

It would be a great defeat of purposes to self-determination if the Institute was not properly accredited. We, therefore, strongly emphasize that a plan for accreditation of the Institute of American Indian Arts be developed and implemented.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, this concludes my statement. On behalf of the Zuni Tribal Council, I wish to extend my appreciation for having been allowed to provide our thoughts regarding H.R. 6850. If there are any questions, I will be happy to respond.

Thank you.

Before I do, I would like to clarify one thing that was brought up by the preceding statement.

As spokesman for our Zuni Tribal Council, I repeat all those things that the tribal council asked me to say. The stands they have taken at a unanimous level.

Mr. LUJAN. You have raised a lot of good questions about the legislation, Governor. Questions that we will have to address. Also, you make the point of saying that the legislation comes about by a sincere effort—and I believe that—of everyone to try to handle this problem in the best way he or she sees as the way it should go. I think everyone realizes we want to make good institutions out of both of them rather than try to dump one for the benefit of the other.

You do, however, while you say you support the legislation, raise some questions about whether it ought to be the Arts and Crafts Board. What is the solution there?

Mr. LEWIS. I would say, Mr. Chairman, in regard to this question I think it is our concern that in previous areas where a board was formed where total input of time, especially in the beginning of operations of any matter, it does take time. It will take time of the Board members if it goes that way to spend, I would say, the first entire 3 months of getting together and getting ready and whatever it takes to put the institute on an operating basis, and perhaps these people have businesses of their own and they cannot really stay away for that length of time.

I think this is true also of the commission I was on previously where part-time schedules just do not get the job on its feet. I think that is the area that we were concerned about for those reasons.

Another thing concerned the Zuni Tribal Council is thus far we have heard no plans or indications if the Albuquerque Indian School was completely left out as a high school what would happen to that land? I would assume—and this is the concern of the Zuni Tribal Council—that if it belongs to GSA they would be within their responsibilities in a position to give it to another Federal agency or perhaps even give it to the town of Albuquerque.

We are not certain and we are concerned in wanting to keep it for the Pueblo operations if that can be continued.

Mr. LUJAN. As a matter of fact, Governor, it is being used for a lot of Pueblo operations now, not just for a school. We would have to look at that.

One final question. The bill does not address location. I gather from the other governors that were here that you are not all together on this thing.

Is Zuni supporting leaving the IAIA in Santa Fe and remodeling the Albuquerque Indian school?

Mr. LEWIS. The Zuni Council has never indicated opposition to the high school but working as a government and because this was created as a national institute at some time back, we also felt that young people should be there and they want sincerely to have the Art Institute continuing. Whether it is in Santa Fe or where, I think in our testimony on another bill in a hearing on Santa Fe, we offered Zuni as a good location rather than have it go out of the area.

Mr. LUJAN. I think that is the solution right there. Everybody says where will we put it. We will put it over there.

Mr. LEWIS. This is the reason why we are taking the stance and we are for a high school, but if it can help young people to accomplish their desires and are fighting for it, we ought to listen to them sometimes. That is why we stand this way.

Mr. LUJAN. Thank you very much, Governor. Thank you for your testimony.

I call next on Mr. Ray Gonyea, assistant museum director, American Indian Museums Association, Niagara Falls, N.Y.

[Prepared statement of Richard Hill may be found in the appendix.]

STATEMENT OF RICHARD HILL, CHAIRMAN, NORTH AMERICAN INDIAN MUSEUMS ASSOCIATION, PRESENTED BY RAY GONYEA, ASSISTANT MUSEUM DIRECTOR

Mr. GONYEA. I will be reading Mr. Richard Hill's testimony. He is the chairman of the North American Indian Museums Association. Mr. Hill was not able to be here today and testify himself and I will be reading his testimony.

Currently, there are three bills being considered by the U.S. Congress relating to the arts and cultures of the native people of this land.

For over 30,000 years, Native Americans have retained their culture and have produced art. It has only been the last 300 years that we have been paid to do so, and it has only been since 1962 that the Federal Government has attempted to institutionalize an educational approach to native art and culture, by the way of the Institute of American Indian Art in Santa Fe, N. Mex.

Our art has survived and evolved and will continue to do so as long as native people firmly hold their traditional culture close to their contemporary lifestyle. Indian art is the expression of individual and collective concern of our future.

As our lifestyle has changed, the Federal Government has taken a more active role in our education. In the last 10 years, Indian involvement, direction, and supervision has been essential to the success of federally sponsored education programs.

Whatever legislation is considered concerning the Federal role in Indian arts, Native American involvement in the designing, planning, and implementation must be assured to a significant degree.

The bill to provide for the operation of the Institute of American Indian Arts by the Indian Arts and Crafts Board—H.R. 6850—does not provide these assurances. The original act, Public Law 355, does not provide for Indian involvement in the operation of the Indian Arts and Crafts board and the Board lacks native American input in the day-to-day operation of its services.

The function of the Arts and Crafts Board in Indian country is not clearly understood as it is presented only as a reactionary agency. Yet, the legislation clearly outlines the powers of the Board.

H.R. 6850 assumes the Board has effectively fulfilled these original mandates. This is an entirely separate issue that needs further exploration and evaluation. Assigning the Institute to a Federal organization that has never managed an Indian school, that has a negative image in the Indian community and does not have key native American staff would be counterproductive.

The only way for the Institute in Santa Fe to achieve its goals, is by contracting with a representative board of native American regents with an ample budget for renovations, construction, and programs. H.R. 6850 could achieve this if the Indian Arts and Crafts Board were authorized and required to contract with a native American board of regents for the operation and development of the Institute.

This board of regents should be comprised of Indian artists, educators, cultural specialists, curriculum developers, business managers, legal professionals, and other appropriate native American administrations.

The talent and concern for the proper development and operation of the Institute is available in the Indian community. However, with dramatic budget increases the Institute will struggle unnecessarily.

The Institute of American Indian Arts must surely continue, but not under the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The recent task force prepared a report on the future of the Institute. However, the task force never examined one of their charges: "The Role of Federal Government in Promoting, Enhancing and Protecting Indian Art and Cultural Values."

The current legislative efforts attempt to address this issue, but we may be moving too quickly to short-term resolutions.

A comprehensive study and evaluation of the need for Federal programs in Indian arts and cultures is the first step. A comprehensive evaluation and development plan is necessary to assess the role of the Institute of American Indian Arts in meeting some of those needs.

In addition, we must look at the development of tribal museums and tribal education programs as a local means to address some of the diverse tribal arts and cultures. Local tribal initiatives in arts and culture is sorely needed and existing tribal facilities and museums—over 70 now in operation—provide for local community programs.

The Indian Arts and Crafts Board also needs study to evaluate their effectiveness and future role in the everchanging world of Indian art.

The role of the National Endowment of the Arts, the National Endowment of the Humanities, the Smithsonian Institution, the National Archives and other Federal agencies in Indian arts and cultural development also need study and evaluation as well for more effective delivery of services to the Indian community.

We must take the time to effectively plan the Federal role in these areas. We must assure native American involvement in the planning and implementation of future programs and we must coordinate activities and functions of tribal museums, Federal agencies, Indian education programs and economic development through the arts.

Our art and culture will survive and the Federal Government can provide additional opportunities for Indian people to develop their artistic and cultural skills.

Mr. LUJAN. Thank you.

One of the suggestions was made that the Arts and Crafts Board, if it went under the Arts and Crafts board, could contract out. I assume the present Board for IAIA could also contract out, could they not, with some other entity?

Mr. GONYEA. My feeling is that the Indian community does not have the structure to do this.

Mr. LUJAN. But you also indicate that you are not particularly happy with the composition of the Arts and Crafts Board.

Mr. GONYEA. No.

Mr. LUJAN. Yet, you would not be able to operate it. Is the Arts and Crafts Board effectively primarily as a commercial help to American Indians to push their products rather than to teach? Is that the primary objective? That is what I gathered from the testimony.

Mr. GONYEA. It has been very successful in museum cultural arts programs but the operation of the school is another thing entirely. The Board still has to operate through the Federal structure, which I understand is one of the basic involvements of the Institute now, having to go through the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the chain of command to a decision.

The Board will still have to operate within such a structure in the Federal Government.

Mr. LUJAN. Thank you very much for your testimony. We appreciate your taking the time to come.

Without objection, the statement of Helen Marie Redbird, president, Native American Council of Regents, Institute of American Indian Arts, will be made part of the record.

[Prepared statement of Helen Marie Redbird may be found in the appendix.]

Mr. LUJAN. Let me go a little bit out of the regular order that we have. Robert Hart, would you care to make any comment on this?

STATEMENT OF ROBERT HART

Mr. HART. I had not come prepared to make any special statement because obviously we are supporting the Department position but I would be pleased to try to answer any questions you might have.

Mr. LUJAN. Your position would be if that is the way the legislation turns out, you will carry out the intent of the legislation?

Mr. HART. That is correct.
Mr. LUJAN. Thank you very much.
There being no further witnesses, the committee is adjourned.
[Whereupon, at 11:50 a.m., the committee was adjourned.]

APPENDIX

Additional Material Submitted for the Hearing Record

TESTIMONY OF HONORABLE SIDNEY R. YATES, CHAIRMAN, APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS, JULY 1, 1980

MR. CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE:

I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you today in support of H.R. 6850, the Indian Arts and Crafts Board Amendments Act of 1980, which provides for the transfer of the Institute of American Indian Arts from the Bureau of Indian Affairs to the Indian Arts and Crafts Board.

Our two committees, Mr. Chairman, the authorization and appropriation committees for the Department of the Interior, have been involved for many years in assuring that the United States fulfills its trust responsibilities toward the American Indian. For the most part we have been successful, although I have often thought that dealing with the Bureau of Indian Affairs is an experience comparable to that of Laocoon's and his sons' dealings with the sea serpents. It was because of the bureaucratic chaos at BIA that my committee welcomed the decision in

The previous numbered page in the original document was blank.

1978 to create an Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs within the Department of the Interior. Many problems, however, still remain.

One of the problems, Mr. Chairman, has been an appalling indifference by the BIA to the preservation and development of Indian art and culture. As a result of certain incidents which came to my attention last year concerning the Institute of American Indian Arts in Santa Fe, New Mexico, I held a special hearing on September 6, 1979 to consider the status and future of the Institute. Testimony was taken from officials of the Department of the Interior and concerned outside witnesses. The facts derived from that hearing, and the inadequate response of the Department of the Interior to the charges made, led to my decision to file the bill now before you.

The Institute of American Indian Arts was established in 1961 by order of Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall and Bureau of Indian Affairs Commissioner Phileo Nash. The basic decision to convert the then-existing Santa Fe Indian School for this purpose had been made by the Eisenhower administration a year previous. It was the sense of those involved in the founding from both administrations that the need existed for a major national center, open to the members of all tribes, where the artistic talents of young Indians could be developed in order to contribute to the revitalization of the art of the American Indian, continuing the American Indian's unique cultural traditions while allow-

ing each succeeding generation the opportunity to evolve its own relationship to those traditions. Santa Fe was chosen because of its historic association with the Indian art revival that began in the 1920's and the fact that the Santa Fe Indian School was no longer needed by Pueblo children and indeed, had been kept going only through enrollment of distant Navajo elementary school children during the transition period of building schools on the Navajo reservation. Moreover, Santa Fe Indian School was falling into a state of disrepair so that substantial sums were going to be necessary for rehabilitation. A new Institute would provide justification for the expenditure of those sums.

The Institute originally provided curricula for a high school education. In 1972, a Board of Regents was named, and in 1975, BIA Commissioner Morris Thompson authorized the Institute to receive a charter as a junior college. The secondary school has gradually been phased out. The Institute has awarded Associate of Fine Arts degrees since 1975 and has been admitted as a candidate for accreditation by the North Central Association of Colleges and the National Association of Schools of Art.

73-476 O—81——4

In the course of my regular appropriations hearings with the BIA and various outside witnesses, it was apparent that there has been, and remains a considerable amount of opposition by almost all the Pueblo tribes to the Institute.

On March 1, 1979, the All Indian Pueblo Council submitted a proposal to BIA to contract with it for the administration and operation of the Institute. The proposal was denied on the grounds that, since the Institute was national in scope, tribal resolutions accompanying the application would be required from all tribes. The Bureau noted, however, that it was considering alternatives to keeping the Institute at Santa Fe, among them the possible transfer of its programs to Haskell Indian Junior College in Lawrence, Kansas.

The AIPC then requested permission to transfer the Albuquerque Indian School, which was under its contract authority, to the facilities of the IAIA. The AIPC stated that the IAIA was underutilized and that present physical conditions of AIS were unsafe.

In June 1979 the Inspector General of the Department of the Interior issued a report on the operations of the IAIA, indicating under-utilization, failure to reduce operating costs, and discrepancies in inventory and financial records.

On July 11, 1979, my Committee was informed by letter from then Assistant Secretary Gerard that the 10th, 11th, and 12th grades of the Albuquerque Indian School were to be transferred to IAIA beginning immediately for the 1979-80 school year. A press release issued that day stated that new enrollment for the Institute would be halted. This information was not in the letter sent to the Committee and, on my insistence, was subsequently retracted. Assistant Secretary Gerard also stated his commitment that a review team be established to analyze the education program of IAIA and its future location.

During the course of these events I received allegations that employees of the Institute were being harassed by the AIPC and the BIA, that priceless artifacts collected in the Museum of IAIA were being taken away, and that employees of the Institute were warned by BIA officials not to talk to the representatives of a U.S. Senator on the ground that it was a violation of the Hatch Act.

The Special Hearing revealed that BIA had never made a firm commitment to the Institute, that it had constantly shifted administrative responsibility back and forth between its Central Office and the Albuquerque Area Office, and that it had made virtually no attempt to recruit students in comparison to its recruitment efforts at Haskell and SIPI, the other BIA run junior colleges. Nor had the Board of Regents of the IAIA been given any authority by the BIA to develop the Institute. Moreover, the Director of the Office of Indian Education Programs refused to concede even the need for a national Indian arts institute, a point my committee believes to have been long since established and affirmed both by the Senate in a 1969 special report entitled "Indian Education: A National Tragedy, a National Challenge," and by the American Indian Policy Review Commission in 1977. It was apparent to me that, if the Institute were to survive, it must be taken out of BIA.

H.R. 6850 is a straightforward method to accomplish that goal. It permits the Department of the Interior, which historically has been responsible for implementing our fiduciary duties to the Indian tribes, to retain ultimate authority over the Institute, but transfers all administrative powers from BIA to the Indian Arts and Crafts Board, an entity within the Department both more expert in and more sympathetic to the areas of Indian art and culture. There should be little, if any, budget impact from this action, as accounts will simply be transferred from BIA to the Arts and Crafts Board.

The Indian Arts and Crafts Board has, since its establishment in 1935, worked to identify Indian cultural leadership and to foster the development of appropriate organizations and institutions to support the independently determined objectives of that leadership. The Board advises directors of Native American cultural centers as well as individual artists, artisans, and groups of Native Americans interested in developing their own production and marketing operations. It also operates a coordinated system of three regional museums with collections of historic, traditional and contemporary American Indian arts, crafts and artifacts. The Board was one of the original advocates for the establishment of IAIA in 1960 and presently serves as an advisory body to the Institute. Its Commissioners are experienced in both art and education, and under their leadership, The Board's professional staff has helped numerous Indian cultural organizations and institutions to develop and achieve self-sufficiency. I have attached to my statement a list of present and former Commissioners of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board plus a statement of some of the Board's accomplishments.

H.R. 6850 amends the powers of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board to take on the additional responsibilities of running the Institute and sets as a goal the attainment of accreditation status for the Institute comparable to other fine arts acalemic institutions. This will permit the Institute to seek accreditation for award of advanced fine arts degrees, to join in cooperative agreements with general curricula colleges for exchange of courses, to provide pre-college art training to gifted students, and ultimately engage in other activities comparable to those of fine arts academic institutions such as the Art Institute of Chicago and the Rhode Island School of Design.

The bill also provides, Mr. Chairman, that the Institute remain on its campus in Santa Fe, New Mexico, and that all other entities presently occupying the campus leave within three years, upon a schedule to be determined by the Secretary of the Interior. Santa Fe has historically been the center for Indian arts, attracting members of all tribes and from all artistic disciplines. It remains both the natural and most logical site for a national Indian art center. The Institute's facilities were designed with that goal in mind. Their underutilization prior to the experiment of sharing the campus with students of the Albuquerque Indian School is a result of the indifference of the Bureau of Indian affairs rather than any failure of the Institute and its concept.

I and my Committee do not desire that Indian children be housed or educated in unsafe structures. We share the concern of the Pueblos for the welfare of their children. I have received reports from the Department of the Interior indicating that a complete rehabilitationof the Albuquerque Indian School campus could be accomplished for $5-7 million. I believe this to be the correct avenue for assuring a proper education and learning environment for both the IAIA and AIS students, and a means of ending the tension that has developed between them.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment briefly on a bill introduced by Barber Conable in the House and John Melcher in the Senate, and presently before your committee. Titled the Native American Culture and Art Development Act (H.R. 6266, S. 2166), it would create an Institute of Native American Culture and Arts Development governed by a Board including the Secretaries of the Smithsonian Institution and the Departments of Interior and Education, the Chairmen of the National Endowments for the Arts and the Humanities, the Librarian of Congress, and thirteen other members. Among other responsibilities, the Board is given authority over both IAIA and the Indian Arts and Crafts Board.

This is an ambitious and praiseworthy bill, Mr. Chairman. I do not believe, however, that it is the proper time for it. The Institute of American Indian Arts has never had an opportunity to develop under the aegis of an authority interested in its survival. While a Board of the type proposed in H.R. 6266 and S. 2166 is excellent for coordinating programs of various agencies, as has been demonstrated in the workings of the Federal Council on the Arts and the Hunanities, it is of little use in the development of individual institutions. This has been indicated in the American Folklife Center, which was constituted with an almost identical board, and which has been riddled with problems of territorial prerogative, each agency more interested in its own programs than in any joint effort. Nor, under the proposed Board, is Indian control assured.

Moreover, the proposed legislation, subjugating the Indian Arts and Crafts Board to the Institute of Native American Culture and Arts Development, takes no account of the hard work and fine track record of the Arts and Crafts Board or the experience of its Commissioners. Nor is there any place within the legislation for the Native American Council of Regents of the Institute of American Indian Arts, which has struggled against the exasperating indifference of BIA in an attempt to maintain quality and high academic standards at IAIA.

IAIA deserves a chance to develop without interference prior to being subject to the will of a handful of different agencies. The Indian Arts and Crafts Board should remain an independent agency within Interior. If the will of the Committee is in the direction of the Native American Culture and Development Act, however, I would suggest the following modifications:

1. Retain the provisions of H.R. 6850, transferring authority over IAIA from BIA to the Indian Arts and Crafts Board;

2. Delete the provisions of H.R. 6266 which transfer the functions of IAIA and the Indian Arts and Crafts Board to the Board of Trustees of the Institute of Native American Culture and Arts Development; and

3. Add the Chairman of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board to the Board of Trustees of the Institute of Native American Culture and Arts Development, in order to ensure the counsel of the Arts and Crafts Board and its Commissioners toward the goals of the Act.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 6850 was developed in response to a problem which has been extensively investigated by my Committee. It represents, to the best of our knowledge, the will of the majority of the Indian Tribes, a goal which should be part of all Congressional action affecting Indians. It is clear, straightforward, and should have little, if any, budget impact, while ensuring the preservation and development of Indian art and culture and providing a training ground of the highest quality for artists and artisans. I thank the Committee for its time and ask for its favorable consideration of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board Amendments Act of 1980.

Indian Arts and Crafts Board — Development of Indian Cultural Institutions

From the very beginning of the agency in 1935, the Commissioners of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board have seen one of the agency's roles to be to identify Indian cultural leadership and to foster the development of appropriate organizations and institutions to support the independently-determined objectives of that leadership. With the conviction by philosophy and by experience that no economic or cultural activity can be self-sustaining unless Indian cultural leaders are in the decision-making role, the agency's approach is to function as a catalyst and stimulus to the activities of others and, in many ways, to serve as a mentor: the professional training and experience of the Commissioners and their staff are made available to Indian leaders without removing the decision-making role from them.

Although the agency may be very directly involved in the planning, management, or actual operation of a particular activity or project, the clearly understood intent is that the activity is to achieve independence from the agency as soon as possible. This is a dynamic process, and the types of organizations and institutions involved over the years have varied from crafts marketing organizations, to educational institutions, to cultural centers, which is a reflection of the evolving activities and priorities of Indian leaders. Likewise, the time periods involved from inception to independence have varied from a very short transition period of a year or so, to a gradual transition that may take ten years or longer, again reflecting the priorities and pace determined by the Indian cultural leaders involved.

For example, the following is a representative summary of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board's past and present involvement with several Indian cultural organizations and institutions, which have achieved varying levels of independence, but which share the common characteristic of having had the Board directly participate in their founding and evolution:

> Qualla Arts & Crafts Mutual, Inc., Cherokee, North Carolina, a crafts marketing cooperative with over 275 members. Founded 1946 as an outgrowth of a BIA reservation arts and crafts program; 1951-55 responsibility transferred to IACB and enterprise directly managed by IACB; 1955 Qualla employed own manager to work under IACB guidance; 1969 IACB moved its office away from Qualla building, and Qualla established promotional exhibition gallery at suggestion of IACB and with IACB design assistance; 1969-76 presented series of member exhibitions designed by IACB, selected jointly, largely funded by state arts council and private foundation grants obtained primarily through IACB expertise; 1976 Qualla constructed new wing on sales building including expanded exhibition gallery, exhibitions continue in consultation with IACB, but selection and funding now made primarily on Qualla's initiative. In almost 35 years, Qualla has evolved from an essentially government-operated coooperative with annual sales of $12,000, to an independently managed cooperative with annual sales of over $350,000, which is recognized as one of the outstanding crafts cooperatives (Indian or non-Indian) in the country.

Institute of Alaskan Native Arts, Inc., Fairbanks, Alaska, an arts advocacy and cultural organization. 1968 Commissioners of IACB recommend to the Secretary of the Interior that an institution similar to the Institute of American Indian Arts be established in Alaska; 1969 Secretary delegates BIA to investigate and proceed, but no tangible result; 1971 Eskimo leader Howard Rock appointed a Commissioner of IACB, impressed by the program of IAIA, begins to discuss and revive the idea that Alaska needs a similar institutional focal point to provide reinforcement and stability to Native cultural activities in the face of imminent economic and other development in Alaska; 1972 IACB receives $25,000 special appropriation (FY 73) for study of the feasibility of developing such an institution, and Commissioners consult with Alaska cultural leaders for reactions; 1973 IACB issues Request For Proposals and contracts with ad-hoc committee of three Native leaders for formal study; 1974 committee submits final report, IACB agrees to act as continuing consultant to committee and asks committee to provide a development plan defining the next steps committee wishes to take, IACB recommends that committee establish itself as non-profit 501(c)(3) organization; 1976 Institute incorporated, Alaska legislature appropriates $75,000 through state arts council but funds lost in council budget cut; 1977 initial funding of $25,000 received from Alaska legislature; 1978 Institute sponsors two statewide cultural conferences to further refine goals, develop links between dispersed Native educational and art centers, and begin program of workshops and seminars. In less than a decade a leadership network has been identified; the leadership has organized itself; and the leadership has begun to coordinate resources and needs. IACB maintains contact with the Institute, but IACB is not now actively involved.

Winona Club, Inc., Rapid City, South Dakota, an arts organization developing a major cultural center which will include the existing Sioux Indian Museum. 1939 Sioux Indian Museum founded by BIA, located in city park building under agreement with City of Rapid City; 1954 program transferred from BIA to IACB; 1961 IACB assists founding of Tipi Shop, Inc., based in museum facility, as non-profit 501(c)(3) organization under Indian management to market regional arts and crafts; 1971 IACB receives Congressional appropriation to expand the city museum building; 1972 as part of redevelopment planning after major flood in Rapid City, city requests relocation of museum to another site in city; 1973 group of Indian residents organize as Winona Club, Inc.(WCI), a non-profit 501(c)(3) organization, to assist with fund-raising for a new museum facility and expanded program of activities; 1974 through assistance of South Dakota Congressional delegation, WCI obtains approval of BIA and GSA to have 118 acres of federal land in the city assigned to IACB for planning purposes; 1975 IACB assists with conceptual planning of facilities proposed by WCI for a major Sioux Indian Cultural

Center, and IACB signs formal working agreement with WCI; 1976 WCI obtains grants for scale model of proposed facilities, and begins fund-raising for the museum facility as Phase I of the proposed center; to date WCI has obtained operating grants to continue its own fund-raising, promotional, and coordinating activities, has purchased ($30,000) an adjoining private parcel of land to improve site access, has arranged construction of coffer dam and related site preparation as part of National Guard exercizes, and continues negotiation with EDA and other agencies for construction of facilities.

[In 1978, IACB began extending similar assistance to the Oklahoma Indian Arts and Crafts Cooperative of Anadarko, Oklahoma, which has enlisted the support of civic leaders and wishes to expand the existing Southern Plains Indian Museum (housed in a state-owned building, but operated by IACB) as the focal point of a Southern Plains Indian Cultural Center.]

COMMISSIONERS OF THE INDIAN ARTS AND CRAFTS BOARD

Lloyd Kiva New (Chairman), internationally-recognized Cherokee educator, artist, and textile designer. Graduate of the Art Institute of Chicago, with a degree in Art Education; founder of Kiva Craft Center (25 shops) in Scottsdale, Arizona; Co-Director of Southwest Indian Arts Project at University of Arizona, sponsored by Rockefeller Foundation, which formed the philosophical foundation for the Institute of American Indian Arts; appointed President of IAIA in 1967, after serving as IAIA's first Arts Director; retired from IAIA in 1978. He has often served as a consultant and lecturer to such organizations as the World Crafts Council, the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), and the Aboriginal Arts Council (Australia); has been a member of the New Mexico Arts Commission; received the International Design Award of the American Institute of Interior Designers, and was among the first designer-craftsmen elected to the Academy of Fellows of the American Crafts Council.

Royal B. Hassrick author, museologist, and anthropologist. Graduate of Dartmouth College; first curator of the Southern Plains Indian Museum; Assistant General Manager of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board; curator of American Indian Art and later Assistant Director of the Denver Art Museum; author of numerous books on western American history, Indians, and the arts, including the classic The Sioux, The Story of the American Indian, and Western Painting Today; most recently a member of the team of three experts responsible for development and installation of the permanent exhibitions at the new multi-million dollar Plains Indian Museum in Cody, Wyoming.

William H. Crowe Cherokee designer-craftsman in wood. Organizing member and later vice-president of Qualla Arts & Crafts Mutual, Inc., crafts marketing cooperative; professional member of the Southern Highlands Hand'-raft Guild; former vice-chairman of the board of directors of Native American Marketing Enterprise, Inc., a non-profit Office Of Economic Opportunity marketing clearinghouse; currently an instructor at Haywood Technical Institute. His creative work has been widely exhibited, and he has been retained as a master craftsman and consultant by the Smithsonian Institution, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, numerous Indian tribes and crafts organizations, and the North Carolina Arts Council.

Gerald J. Gray Blackfeet educator, specialist and consultant in designing and producing bilingual-bicultural history, language, and cultural materials. Graduate of University of Montana and Northern Montana College (Master of Education); first superintendent of Rocky Boy Reservation school district and its national model Indian-controlled school; currently a consultant to Indian tribal education programs in such states as Montana, Wisconsin, Colorado, and North Dakota, and to such organizations as the Coalition of Indian Controlled School Boards. He was named Outstanding Indian Educator of Montana, and was the recipient of a two-year Ford Foundation Leadership Development Program Fellowship.

W. Richard West Cheyenne artist, sculptor, and educator. Graduate of the University of Oklahoma (Master of Fine Arts); widely recognized as an artist and as mentor to two generations of Indian artists; director of the Art Department of Bacone College; later chairman of the Humanities Division at Haskell Indian Junior College; retired 1978. His art work is in many major museums and private collections, and he has received numerous awards including the Waite Phillips Trophy presented by the Philbrook Art Center, and an honorary D.F.A. degree from Baker University.

March 1980

FORMER COMMISSIONERS OF THE INDIAN ARTS AND CRAFTS BOARD

Willard W. Beatty (Chairman) educator; chief executive of Save The Children Federation; director of Division of Education, Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Laura Bergt Eskimo rights advocate; member of various Alaska state commissions and boards concerned with Native American education and cultural development; member of National Council on Indian Opportunity.

E. K. Burlew administrative Assistant to Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes (served an initial appointment to begin agency operations).

John Collier (Chairman) author; Indian rights advocate; Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

Frederick J. Dockstader (Chairman) author; silversmith; museologist; director of Museum of the American Indian.

Frederic H. Douglas author; museologist; curator of Denver Art Museum.

Rene d'Harnoncourt (Chairman) author; museologist; director of Museum of Modern Art; organizer of the artistic and cultural section of United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO); initial member of National Council on the Arts.

Lorenzo Hubbell collector; dealer; founder of Hubbell's Trading Post (a National Monument).

Paul F. Huldermann collector; civic leader; dealer, House of the Six Directions.

Alvin M. Josephy, Jr author; Indian historian; editor-in-chief, American Heritage Publishing Company.

Alfred V. Kidder archaeologist; educator; author; chairman, Division of Historical Research, Carnegie Institution of Washington; faculty, Peabody Museum, Harvard University.

Eric Kohlberg collector; marketing expert; dealer, Kohlberg's.

William Lippincott anthropologist; Navajo trading post operator; director of Museum of International Folk Art.

Joseph McCaskill marketing expert; Assistant Commissioner of Indian Affairs; director of Bolivian Development Corporation.

Vincent Price (Chairman) actor; collector; consultant on art marketing, Sears Roebuck & Co.

Howard Rock artist; Eskimo rights advocate; founding publisher and editor of Tundra Times.

Louis C. West merchandising expert; first General Manager of Indian Arts and Crafts Board.

Mitchell A. Wilder educator; museologist; director of Chouinard Art Institute; director of Amon Carter Museum of Western Art.

James W. Young educator; expert on distribution and marketing; president of J. Walter Thompson Co.; founder of the Advertising Council; professor of business history and advertising, University of Chicago.

March 1980

STATEMENT OF DARRELL KNUFFKE, DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BEFORE THE JULY 1, 1980, HEARING OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, ON H.R. 6850

Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, we are pleased to have an opportunity to present our views on H.R. 6850, a bill to transfer operation of the Institute of American Indian Arts from the Office of Indian Education in the Bureau of Indian Affairs to the Indian Arts and Crafts Board.

The bill further provides that use of the Institute's Santa Fe campus by any other entity would be phased out over a three year period. Those two provisions, Mr. Chairman, fairly explain not only what the legislation is meant to accomplish but—inferentially—why it was considered necessary in the first place. I refer to a decision made last year by the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs to allow the All-Indian Pueblo Council to transfer temporarily high school students from the Albuquerque Indian School, where many of the facilities are old and considered to be unsafe, to the art institute which has been running at much less than full capacity and had adequate empty space to house the high school students.

I believe it is the view of many people that a history of inconsistent guidance and inefficient management by the BIA allowed the institute to deteriorate to the point that it was vulnerable to a group with a demonstrable need.

We certainly agree with the bill's sponsor, Congressman Yates, that some steps must be taken to ensure that the past pattern of inefficiency and indirection is eliminated. Mr. Yates has been, over the years, one of the best friends the institute has; it does not overstate the case to suggest that there might be no institute today but for his support. And in that assessment, I include the interest and concern he has shown in recent months over the impact the joint use of the campus has had on the students, faculty and administration—certainly on the very future—of the institute. We whole-heartedly concur that the institute must not only survive but must thrive, grow, and expand. We are committed to achieving expansion and excellence at the art institute and believe we can do so.

Unfortunately, we disagree with the approach the bill proposes and must therefore oppose it.

First, Mr. Chairman, we do not believe the bill is necessary. The Secretary already has the authority, under the Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1950, to transfer the IAIA to any other Departmental entity. But assuming the need to transfer the institute—and we agree to that need, as I will discuss later—we strongly believe the Indian Arts and Crafts Board is not the proper place to lodge that authority.

I would like to give you a bit of background on the institute and the Arts and Crafts Board to explain why we hold that view.

The Institute of American Indian Arts was created by the Secretary of the Interior in 1962. It was opened that year to 140 carefully recruited students in the 10th through 12th grades and to a few post-high school students who took two post-secondary academic courses.

The Institute has, from the beginning been a progressive arts school which has encouraged its students to draw upon their cultural heritages while experimenting in non-traditional media as well as using traditional forms. The Institute's statement of philosophy sums up the purpose of this approach:

73-476 O—81——5

> The underlying philosophy of the program is that unique cultural tradition can be honored and can be used creatively as the springboard to a meaningful contemporary life.... The Institute holds that cultural differences are a rich wellspring from which may be drawn new creative forces relevant to contemporary conditions and environments. We believe that, ultimately, by learning to link the best in Indian culture to contemporary life, the young Indian will be able to solve his own problems and enrich the world scene in the process.

That philosophy has governed the institute since its inception. It has been inextricably—and most appropriately—bound to and involved with every other aspect of contemporary Indian life. Its emphasis, its focus, its directions have been sensitive to shifts in the perceptions, aspirations and frustrations of Indian people. The art it ultimately produces has reflected that, often with devastating accuracy and impact.

We believe much of that is due to the fact that the Institute of American Indian Art has been, since its inception, a part of Indian affairs programs in the Department. We believe it is important that the Institute remain a part of the broader world of Indian affairs in the Department because it is a vital and interdependent part of that world.

The Indian Arts and Crafts Board was originally created for the very narrow purpose of helping Indians economically by expanding the market for their arts and crafts. It has done that important job well and continues to do it well today. But it is not a part of Indian Affairs and cannot feel as acutely the pressures, tensions, and changes in the Indian community. The Arts and Crafts Board has no programmatic functions similar to those of other agencies in the Department. It does not and, we believe, cannot operate schools—at least as presently constituted.

There is, we believe, a symbolic danger in such a relationship as H.R. 6850 proposes. Despite the problems the Institute has experienced, Mr. Chairman, it still enjoys a superb reputation in the art world. That, I think, is one of the most promising aspects of its future. If it were to become subordinate to the Arts and Crafts Board—which is known mainly as a marketing board—I believe we would risk inviting the public perception that commercialization had somehow replaced artistic and cultural honesty and sensitivity. I do not for a moment suggest that such would actually be the case; I mean rather that, given the buffeting the institute has already suffered, we should be alert to that danger.

Finally, placing the Institute under the Board would deprive it of the Indian leadership and guidance otherwise available to it through the Native American Council of Regents and the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs.

If it is true, as we believe, that the Institute derives much of its artistic vitality from its association with Indian Affairs, it is also true that its decline has occurred under the management of the BIA. The challenge, it seems to us, is to retain the one and reverse the other. Under Secretary James Joseph recently made a series of decisions which we believe will accomplish that goal.

First, he has directed that responsibility for the Institute be transferred from the Bureau of Indian Affairs to the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs. This, we believe, will give the Institute the attention, visibility and support within the Department it deserves. Implicit in this decision is the Under Secretary's commitment to the future of the institute and that will be clear to those involved in decisions about its future.

We believe it is time to remove the institute from the Bureau because the institute is generally quite different from other BIA schools. It has never been compatible with them and probably never will be. The Bureau has, over the years, shuffled authority for the institute from the Area Office to the Central Office and back again. It has had five administrators in two years. It has never had the stability it needed over a sustained period of time. The wonder is not that it has suffered; the wonder is that it has survived.

That seems to reflect a lack of commitment over the years, perhaps a lack of interest, in the future of the institute. We believe it is important now—practically as well as symbolically—to elevate the status of the institute within the department while we begin the work of stabilizing the school and providing for its sound long-term management.

Second, the Under Secretary has directed the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs to establish a small management team, using the resources of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Policy, Budget, and Administration; the Office of Indian Education; and the Native American Council of Regents to develop an efficient mannagement strategy for the Institute.

Third--and we believe this is critical for the long-range future of the institute--we will begin immediately to work with the Native American Council of Regents to clarify and strengthen the Council's status so it can assume, to the extent possible, the functions normally associated with boards of regents in the management of post-secondary schools. Its status now is little more than advisory and it has long sought a change in that status.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, to resolve the present dispute over use of the campus, the Under Secretary has taken these actions: The All-Indian Pueblo Council needs safe, pleasant surroundings for its students and understandably wants them very badly. We will seek the immediate renovation of the Albuquerque Indian School so the Pueblo students can be returned there as soon as possible and so the Santa Fe campus can be restored to the use of the Institute.

Meanwhile, the Pueblo high school students will remain at Santa Fe--for what we hope will be no more than two years. During that time, the Under Secretary has directed that the President of the institute will have full authority for the Santa Fe campus to eliminate many of the tensions which now stem from shared administration.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, we are committed to the preservation and growth of the Institute. We believe the steps outlined here will achieve tht and we look forward to working with the Committee to that end.

That concludes my statement. I will be happy to try to answer any questions you might have. -8-

ALL INDIAN PUEBLO COUNCIL

TESTIMONY OF
DELFIN J. LOVATO, CHAIRMAN
ALL INDIAN PUEBLO COUNCIL
ON
H.R. 6850
BEFORE THE
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR & INSULAR AFFAIRS
JULY 1, 1980

Mr. Chairman and members of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, my name is Delfin Lovato, I am Chairman of the All Indian Pueblo Council representing the nineteen New Mexico Pueblo Tribes. I have with me today to present testimony on behalf of the Pueblo people of New Mexico Governor Alvino Lucero of Isleta; Governor Paul Tafoya of Santa Clara, Paul Bernal a member of the Taos Pueblo Council, and Mr. Benny Starr, official spokesman and Council-member of the Pueblo of Santo Domingo.

On behalf of eighteen of the nineteen Pueblo Tribes, I am here to speak in opposition to H.R. 6850, the "Indian Arts and Crafts Board Act of 1980." The Pueblo tribes strongly feel that H.R. 6850 is not in the best interest of Indian art and is a poor means by which to accomplish the stated objectives. We consider H.R. 6850

as nothing more than an effort to legislate approximately 350 Pueblo Indian children in grades 10, 11, and 12, out of the Santa Fe Indian School campus which is referred to in the bill as the Institute of American Indian Arts (IAIA), and basically terminate the Pueblo peoples effort at self-determination. We feel strongly that H.R. 6850, despite a worthy objective, does not address the real problem which exists at the Institute of American Indian Arts, and will not accomplish the task of preservation and development of American art and culture.

We view the proposed transfer of the Institute of American Indian Arts from the BIA Education to the Arts and Crafts Board as nothing more than transferring an unresolved problem from one agency to another. It is important to note also that in our opinion, the Indian Arts and Crafts Board has not demonstrated any ability or experience in administering an art education program and for that matter has failed to demonstrate any leadership in the development of Indian arts and crafts.

The reasons for the dire situation at the Institute of American Indian Arts cannot be blamed totally on mismanagement and BIA neglect. Reasonable funds and adequate staffing has always been available. The fact is that there has not been the mad rush or interest in art education as some had predicted and as this legislation assumes exists. It is important to note here, Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, that the eighteen year history of the Institute is one of failure, mismanagement, under-enrollment, under-utilization of

facilities, and a per pupil cost exceeding $18,000 per student per year. The BIA and the Board of Regents must bear the burden.

The Pueblo Indians of New Mexico are commonly referred to as the bedrock of Indian culture and tradition. Yet, we have been accused of being anti-art. For the record, let me state that no one cherishes their culture, tradition, and art, more than the Pueblo people. However, we do not believe in institutionalizing this important and vital part of our culture. We believe that culture like Indian language and art is best taught in the home. Come to New Mexico and visit the Pueblo communities and you can best understand what I say here. We do not believe, no matter how noble the thought, that the Congress or any agency within the Federal Government can teach and perpetuate that which we have been able to do for centuries before the Europeans came to our part of the country. We strongly feel that the federal role in preserving Indian art and culture should be limited to one of providing funds directly to tribal governments and tribal institutions for assistance. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, the people that have been most responsible and successful in the preservation of Indian art and culture have been the Indian people themselves.

We are willing to support the development of a national institute if a need for such afacility can be demonstrated and if the Indian people of this country will be given an opportunity to have a voice in determining its location and the manner in which it will be administered. This thought gentlemen, is in line with the congressional mandate of Indian self-determination as announced

in P.L. 93-638, "The Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act," and in line with the position of the National Tribal Chairmen's Association and the National Congress of American Indians who represent the vast majority of Indian Tribes in this Country. We can not support the continuation of the Institute of American Indian Arts concept under the present circumstances where the cost per student per year exceeds $18,000 per student, no more than we can support the continuation of this program in a faciltiy which was built for 500 students being utilized by a mere 100-150 students. Please note that in the 1890's the Santa Fe Indian School was built for the education of Pueblo, Navajo, Apache, and Ute Indian children. It served as the primary educational institute until 1962 when the BIA adopted a policy of forcing Indian children into the public school system as another means of assimulating the Indian people into the so-called dominate society. In 1962, dispite strong tribal opposition, our high school program was terminated and the Institute of American Indian Arts was started. Over the eighteen year period the school basically failed in its objective.

On the other hand, the Pueblo Governments in 1976, under provisions of P.L. 93-638, undertook the task of administering and operating its own secondary program, which was perhaps the BIA's worst program in the country, the Albuquerque Indian School (AIS), located in Albuquerque, New Mexico.

Over a period of three years, we have demonstrated, beyond a doubt, our ability in developing a first-rate educational program for grades 7 - 12. Our efforts to continue our successful program at the Albuquerque Indian School became jeopardized after 95% of our facilities were declared as unsafe for utilization by our children. It was then that the Pueblo leadership began looking at alternatives and found that the Santa Fe Indian School campus was grossly under-utilized and was being grossly mismanaged. We also found that Haskell Institute, another institution being run by the BIA, was suffering by under-utilization. We therefore, proposed to BIA that the Institute of American Indian Arts program be transferred to Haskell Institute and that we be allowed the use of the Santa Fe facility which was historically ours, for the development and continuation of our efforts at Indian self-determination in the education of our children.

Needless to say, advocates of Indian art took this as an affront and erroneously labeled our efforts an effort to distroy Indian art. The Pueblo tribes have taken their case before the National Congress of American Indians, the National Tribal Chairmen's Association, and Indian artists from different parts of the country. The bast majority of Indian tribes support the following principles and positions:

1) That the Pueblo Tribes be allowed to continue their efforts of self-determination in the education of their children at the Santa Fe Indian School campus.

2) That if there is to be a national art institute that there be constructed a first-rate art institute, in a location to be determined through consultation with Indian tribes and their artists, and to be administered in the same manner.

3) That the scope of such an institute be limited to the arts and that the religious aspects inherent in all Indian tribes, their culture, and traditions, will not be violated or interferred with through institutionalization.

Mr. Chairman these have been the same recommendations of the Department of Interior's Task Force which was appointed by the Secretary of Indian Affairs, Cecil Andrus. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, we strongly request that this also be the position of the Full Committee of Interior and Insular Affairs.

Thank you.

PUEBLO of ISLETA

P.O. Box 317
Isleta, New Mexico 87022

Office of the Governor

Telephone
(505) 869-3111
(505) 869-6333

TESTIMONY

H.R. 6850

SENATE COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

MR. CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE, THANK YOU FOR THIS OPPORTUNITY TO PRESENT TESTIMONY ON H.R.6850 THE "NATIVE AMERICAN CULTURE AND ART DEVELOPMENT ACT". I AM ALVINO LUCERO, GOVERNOR OF THE PUEBLO OF ISLETA.

FIRST, ON BEHALF OF THE TRIBAL COUNCIL OF ISLETA PUEBLO, I AM IN FULL SUPPORT OF THE POSITION OF THE ALL INDIAN PUEBLO COUNCIL AND FULLY SUPPORT THE COMMENTS AND STATEMENTS WHICH HAS BEEN MADE BY MY FELLOW GOVERNORS FROM THE VARIOUS PUEBLOS. WE TOO, MUST REITERATE THE OPPOSITION TO S.2166 FOR IT CLEARLY IS, INTENDED TO DRIVE OUR EXCELLENT HIGH SCHOOL PROGRAM OUT OF THE SANTA FE FACILITY. HISTORICALLY, THIS FACILITY BELONGS TO THE NEW MEXICO PUEBLOS, AND WE AS PUEBLO LEADERS CANNOT UNDERSTAND HOW A CONGRESSMAN OR SPECIAL-INTEREST GROUPS ARE SO INSISTANT IN TRYING TO GAIN CONTROL OF THIS FACILITY UNDER THE GUISE OF "TRYING TO SAVE INDIAN CULTURE AND ART". WE CANNOT UNDERSTAND HOW A HANDFUL OF INDIVIDUALS WHO CALL THEMSELVES "INDIANS" CAN CHALLENGE THE WEIGHT OF TRIBAL OPINION WHICH SUPPORTS OUR POSITION. IF THE NAVAJOS AND ZUNI PUEBLO WANT THIS FACILITY, THEN BUILD IT ON THEIR LANDS OR ELSEWHERE, BUT, LEAVE THE SANTA FE INDIAN SCHOOL FOR THE RIO GRANDE PUEBLOS STUDENTS. UNFORTUNATELY, THIS WHOLE CONTROVERSY TO CONTROL OUR OWN EDUCATIONAL FUTURE OF OUR CHILDREN HAS BEEN CREATED BY A HANDFUL OF INDIVIDUALS WHO DO NOT REPRESENT TRIBAL GOVERNMENT BUT RATHER THEIR OWN PRIVATE INTERESTS.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

73-476 O—81——6

SECONDLY, ISLETA PUEBLO DOES NOT WANT THE CONGRESS TO INTERFERE WITH OUR TRADITION AND CULTURE. OUR LANGUAGE, HISTORY, CUSTOMS, BELIEF, MUSIC, DANCE AND RITUALS BELONGS TO US AND WE WILL NOT TOLERATE ANY WHITEMAN OR ANYONE ELSE TELLING US HOW TO PRESERVE THEM. WE CONSIDER ANY ATTEMPTS BY ANYONE TO TEACH OR CONVEY BY ANY MEANS THAT WHICH WE CONSIDER "OURS" AN INTRUSION INTO OUR PRIVATE RELIGIOUS RIGHTS. OUR INDIAN RELIGION HAS PREVAILED BECAUSE WE GUARD IT CLOSELY AND WILL CONTINUE TO DO SO WITH ALL INTENSITY. IT IS WITH THIS IN MIND, THAT WE ARE OPPOSED TO ANY ATTEMPTS TO INSTITUTIONALIZE OUR LANGUAGE, SONGS, BELIEFS, HISTORY AND RITUALS.

WE KNOW AND UNDERSTAND THAT SOME TRIBES, OTHER THAN PUEBLOS, HAVE LOST THEIR IDENTITY AND THEIR RITUALS, LANGUAGE, ETC., AND ATTEMPTS ARE MADE TO TRY TO REVIVE OR COLLECT DATA TO DETERMINE HOW THE "LOST - TRIBES" LIVED. TO YOU THIS DATA WOULD BE HISTORY BY WHICH THOSE WHO DON'T KNOW CAN LEARN FROM THIS HISTORY. BUT LET ME EMPHASIZE THAT WE PUEBLO PEOPLE ARE NOT LOST, SO PLEASE DON'T TRY TO "SAVE" US. THE U.S. GOVERNMENT'S EFFORTS TO PRESERVE, SUPPORT, REVITALIZE AND DISSEMINATE INDIAN ART AND CULTURE WOULD BE AN INTRUSION ON OUR RELIGIOUS BELIEFS THAT NO WHITEMAN HAS ANY BUSINESS TO TRY TO SAVE THAT WHICH IS SACRED TO US. IF THERE IS TO BE AN ART INSTITUTE OR MUSEUM, THEN BUILD IT ELSEWHERE OUTSIDE OF PUEBLO TERRITORY. IN THE PAST, PUEBLO LANDS AND "SHRINES" HAVE BEEN LOST THROUGH POOR LEGISLATION WHICH HAD NO BEARING TOWARDS THE FEELINGS AND CONCERNS OF PUEBLO INDIANS. DON'T LET THIS BILL BE ANOTHER OF THESE MISTAKES. PLEASE HAVE SYMPATHY FOR OUR CONCERNS AND LEAVE PUEBLO ARTS AND CULTURE TO THE PUEBLO PEOPLE FOR OUR CULTURE AND TRADITIONS HAVE SURVIVED SIMILAR ATTEMPTS BY THE SPANISH AND MEXICAN GOVERNMENTS.

LET ME FURTHER EMPHASIZE THAT WE MOST CERTAINLY WILL OUT-LIVE ANY EFFORTS BY ANYONE TO INTERFERE WITH THAT ASPECT OF OUR WAY OF LIFE. THE TRICENTENNIAL COMMEMORATION OF THE PUEBLO REVOLT OF 1680 IS HERE TO HELP US CELEBRATE THIS EVENT BY LISTENING TO OUR CONCERNS AND DOING AWAY WITH H.R. 6850.

THE CONCERNS THAT I HAVE EXPRESSED HERE IN FRONT OF THIS COMMITTEE ARE THE CONCERNS OF MY PUEBLO INDIANS WHO HAVE LIVED IN THEIR RESPECTIVES PUEBLOS, SINCE, BEFORE THE WHITEMEN EVER STEPPED INTO WHAT WE NOW KNOW AS THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

INDIAN SELF-DETERMINATION HAS BEEN GIVEN TO THE AMERICAN INDIANS, AND, WHAT I WOULD LIKE TO SEE IS THAT WE BE GIVEN THE OPPORTUNITY TO DETERMINE OUR OWN DESTINY.

AGAIN, THANK YOU FOR GIVING ME THIS OPPORTUNITY TO PRESENT MY VIEWS AND TESTIMONY ON H.R. 6850.

AL/LA

STATEMENT OF ELLA MAE HORSE, NATIONAL CONGRESS OF AMERICAN INDIANS, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS ON H.R. 6850, THE INDIAN ARTS AND CRAFTS BOARD AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1980, JULY 1, 1980, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee. Thank you for the opportunity to present the views of the National Congress of American Indians on the bill, H.R. 6850, relating to the Institute of American Indian Arts.

I am Ella Mae Horse, an officer of the National Congress of American Indians and a member of the Interior Department's Advisory Committee on American Indian Art and Culture.

Mr. Chairman, NCAI has gone on record on several occasions on matters relating to the Santa Fe facility.

Most recently, NCAI passed Resolution 80-94 relating to S. 2166, the Native American Culture and Art Development Act. NCAI requested, among other things, funds for the construction of a first-rate art institute at a location to be determined by the Indian people and administered in the same manner.

I realize that the Senate bill is not under consideration here today but I hope that the resolution relating to it will be placed in the hearing record inasmuch as it relates to the art institute and the education of the Pueblo children.

Mr. Chairman, we have no problem with the findings of the Congress as set forth in H.R. 6850. We especially agree that the United States owes a responsibility of trust to the tribes of the American Indian and the members thereof, and it is in this light that we must oppose the bill.

H.R. 6850 places a priority on the preservation and development of Indian art without due consideration to the concerns of the Pueblo tribal governments who are principally affected by the legislation. As pointed out earlier, NCAI supports the construction of a first-rate art institute and would assist with seeking adequate funds for such a facility. But an overriding issue of Pueblo tribal input and control over the educational and service programs directly affecting their tribal welfare is not addressed in H.R. 6850. As stated in Resolution 80-94 NCAI supports this principle and supports the efforts of the Pueblo tribal governments in providing basic education for their children at the Santa Fe campus.

Further, Mr. Chairman, I am not at all certain that transferring the administration of the art program to the Indian Arts and Crafts Board, an operation that needs oversight itself, would not add to the administrative problems that already burden the program.

When the Interior Department's Advisory Committee on American Indian Art and Culture met at Santa Fe on March 8, it unanimously approved a resolution containing the following points:

— The Advisory Committee is on record as supporting both programs — the art institute and the Santa Fe Indian School;

— The Committee is on record as supporting the "construction of a first-rate art facility" in a location and a place to be determined through consultation with Indian artists and Indian tribal governments;

— In the interim, the administrators of the Santa Fe Indian School and Institute of American Indian Art be directed to develop alternatives "which would best accommodate both programs in an atmosphere of cooperation and respect for one another."

If this is not the answer, it is a step in the right direction. Please be assured that NCAI stands ready to work with all concerned to resolve this situation to the best interests of the Pueblo tribal governments and the talented art students.

NATIONAL CONGRESS OF AMERICAN INDIANS

202 E STREET, N.E., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20002 (202) 546-1168

NCAI RESOLUTION NO. 80 - 94

NATIVE AMERICAN CULTURE AND ART DEVELOPMENT ACT

WHEREAS, the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI) was established on the principles and for the purpose of protecting and preserving the rights and powers of tribal governments; and

WHEREAS, the Constitution and By-Laws of NCAI clearly establishes as one of its most sacred inalienable purposes as being the promotion and advocacy of Indian self-determination; and

WHEREAS, the principles of NCAI, as well as the principles of self-determination, mandates the Executive Council of NCAI to support the self-determination efforts of any member tribe and to oppose any effort by the Congress to deny or deprive such members from exercising such rights; and

WHEREAS, NCAI has continually supported local control as a means of achieving self-determination by Indian tribes and has opposed governmental, as well as congressional interference, in that process; and

WHEREAS, S. 2166, the "Native American Culture and Art Development Act," has recently been introduced and is designed to preserve and promote Indian art and culture, but will deny the Pueblo tribes of educational self-determination and will have a destructive effect on Pueblo children and their cultural, social, and economic way of life; and

WHEREAS, the objective of S. 2166 is to create another national "Institute of Native American Culture and Art Development", and to institutionalize "Indian languages, beliefs, customs, dances, rituals, crafts, music, architecture and drama", and to systematically exploit native Pueblo culture.

WHEREAS, S. 2166 will deny the Pueblo tribes of self-determination by depriving them of the use of the Santa Fe Indian School campus which it presently shares with the Institute of American Indian Art-; and

WHEREAS, the Santa Fe facility (historically it belonged to the New Mexico Tribes) was never built as an art school for 150 students, but rather for a high school for 504 students; and

WHEREAS, the Pueblo tribes of New Mexico and the National Congress of American Indians strongly object to the institutionalization of "rituals, crafts, music, architecture and drama, dances, customs and their language", on the grounds that they are an intricate part of their religion.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Executive Council of the National Congress of American Indians opposes S. 2166, as presently proposed and requests that it be amended to allow the Pueblo tribes to continue their efforts at self-determination in the education of their children at the Santa Fe Indian School campus.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the U.S. Congress amend S. 2166 to provide for the construction of a first rate art institute, in a location to be determined through consultation with Indian tribes and their artists, and to be administered in the same manner.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the National Congress of American Indians and the National Tribal Chairmens Association be allowed to have a representative on any board established to administer said institute and that the scope of such an institute be limited to the arts and that the religious aspects inherent in all Indian tribes, their culture and traditions will not be violated or interferred with through institutionalization.

CERTIFICATION

The Executive Council duly convened at the NCAI Executive Council meeting in Washington, D.C. on January 23, 1980, voted to approve this resolution.

NATIONAL CONGRESS OF
AMERICAN INDIANS

PRESIDENT

ATTEST:
Ella Mae Horse
NCAI RECORDING SECRETARY

STATEMENT

OF

ROBERT E. LEWIS, GOVERNOR, PUEBLO OF ZUNI

TO

H.R. 6850

A BILL TO AMEND THE ACT OF AUGUST 27, 1935, TO PROVIDE FOR THE ADMINISTRATION, MAINTENANCE, AND OPERATION OF THE INSTITUTE OF AMERICAN INDIAN ARTS BY THE INDIAN ARTS & CRAFTS BOARD

TO

THE COMMITTEE OF INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WASHINGTON, D.C.

JULY 1, 1980

MR. CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE:

FIRST, LET ME EXPRESS THE APPRECIATION OF THE ZUNI TRIBAL COUNCIL TO YOU, FOR TIME GIVEN ME TO PRESENT TESTIMONY IN THEIR BEHALF REGARDING H.R. 6850.

THE ZUNI TRIBAL COUNCIL WISHES TO EMPHASIZE THE FOLLOWING POINTS IN TODAYS TESTIMONY.

1. MANAGEMENT AND POLICY DEVELOPMENT RELATING TO THE FUTURE

OPERATION OF THE INSTITUTE OF AMERICAN INDIAN ARTS.

2. TRANSFER OF POWERS AND RESPONSIBILITY FROM THE BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS TO THE INDIAN ARTS & CRAFTS BOARD.
3. FUTURE APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE INSTITUTE OF AMERICAN INDIAN ARTS.
4. OCCUPATION AT THE SANTA FE CAMPUS BY OTHER ENTITIES.
5. ACCREDITATION OF THE INSTITUTE OF AMERICAN INDIAN ARTS.

WE HAVE REVEIWED OTHER TESTIMONY ON H.R. 6850 AND FOUND THESE AREAS NEEDING FURTHER CLARIFICATION.

THE ZUNI TRIBAL COUNCIL BELIEVES THAT H.R. 6850 IS VERY PROGRESSIVE IN THAT IT LEGALLY ESTABLISHES THE INSTITUTE OF AMERICAN INDIAN ARTS, AND IS A SINCERE ATTEMPT TO DEAL WITH THE MANY ADMINISTRATIVE AND RELATED PROBLEMS THAT THE INSTITUTE HAS FACED SINCE ITS ESTABLISHMENT.

H.R. 6850 RECOGNIZES THAT NATIVE AMERICAN CULTURES HAVE GREATLY CONTRIBUTED TO THE CULTURAL RICHNESS OF AMERICAN SOCIETY.

H.R. 6850 RECOGNIZES THAT THE UNITES STATES GOVERNMENT OWES A TRUST RESPONSIBILITY TO AMERICAN INDIAN TRIBES AND THAT POINT OF THIS TRUST RESPONSIBILITY INCLUDES ASSISTING TO PRESERVE AND DEVELOP AMERICAN INDIAN ART.

H.R. 6850 RECOGNIZES THAT THE INSTITUTE OF AMERICAN INDIAN ARTS HAS BEEN MISMANAGED AND NEGLECTED, AND THE B.I.A. HAS THEREFORE FAILED TO

ACCOMPLISH ITS RESPONSIBILITY TO PROPERLY ADMINISTER, MAINTAIN AND OPERATE THE INSTITUTE.

1. MANAGEMENT AND POLICY DEVELOPMENT RELATING TO THE FUTURE OPERATION OF THE INSTITUTE OF AMERICAN INDIAN ARTS.

   A) H.R. 6850 DOES NOT ADAQUATELY SPECIFY THE ROLE OF THE INDIAN ARTS & CRAFTS BOARD, FOR WHAT STANDARDS THEY WILL USE TO EFFECTIVELY ADMINISTER THE IAIA PROGRAM. WE ARE NOT SURE THAT THIS ORGANIZATION HAS THE CAPABILITY FOR CARRYING OUT THIS RESPONSIBILITY.

   B) THERE NEEDS TO BE A MORE DEFINITIVE DESCRIPTION OF THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE INDIAN ARTS & CRAFTS BOARD.

WE RECOMMEND THAT A GOVERNING BODY MUST BE APPOINTED EXPRESSLY FOR THE PURPOSE OF PROVIDING POLICY DIRECTION AND OVERALL SUPERVISION FOR THE IAIA. IT IS OUR FEAR THAT A BOARD COMPRISED OF PEOPLE WHO HAVE OTHER RESPONSIBILITIES WILL NOT DEVOTE THE FULL TIME NECESSARY FOR SUCH ISSUES AS:

REORGANIZATION, AND TRANSITION FROM THE BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS, FOR THE PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT AND EVALUATION THAT IS ESSENTIAL IF THE IAIA IS TO FULFILL ITS RESPONSIBILITY TO ITS STUDENTS.

THE DESCRIPTION OF THE BOARD, ITS COMPOSITION AND ROLE AS IT RELATES TO THE OVERALL PURPOSES OF THE INSTITUTE OF AMERICAN INDIAN ARTS MUST BE CLARIFIED.

2. TRANSFER OF POWERS AND RESPONSIBILITY FROM BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS TO THE INDIAN ARTS & CRAFTS BOARD.

SECTION 4 OF H.R. 6850 ADDRESSES THE TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATIVE POWERS, RESPONSIBILITY, AND PERFORMANCE OF ALL FUNCTIONS OF THE IAIA FROM THE BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS TO THE INDIAN ARTS & CRAFTS BOARD. THIS SECTION RAISES SEVERAL IMPORTANT QUESTIONS REGARDING SUCH TRANSFER:

A) HOW LONG WILL THE TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATIVE POWERS AND RESPONSIBILITIES FOR ALL FUNCTIONS TAKE?

B) WHAT PROCEDURAL STEPS WILL BE TAKEN TO INSURE THAT TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATIVE POWERS AND RESPONSIBILITIES FOR ALL FUNCTIONS ASSURE IMPROVED ADMINISTRATION AND MANAGEMENT?

C) IS A TRANSITIONAL PERIOD BEING CONTEMPLATED FOR ORDERLY TRANSFER OF POWERS AND RESPONSIBILITY?

D) AND WHAT IS THE TIME FRAME FOR TRANSITION?

THE TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATIVE POWERS AND RESPONSIBILITIES FOR ALL FUNCTIONS IMPLIES THAT MONIES WILL BE AVAILABLE FOR THE OPERATION OF ALL FUNCTIONS OF THE INSTITUTE OF AMERICAN INDIAN ARTS. H.R. 6850 DOES NOT SPECIFY WHAT APPROPRIATION WILL BE PROVIDED FOR THE MAINTENANCE, AND IMPROVEMENT OF TOTAL OPERATIONS. THE ZUNI TRIBAL COUNCIL RECOMMENDS THAT THE ABOVE QUESTIONED AREAS AND APPROPRIATION OF FUNDS FOR FUTURE OPERATIONS BE ADDRESSED AND CLARIFIED.

3. OCCUPATION OF SANTA FE CAMPUS BY OTHER ENTITIES.

SECTION 4 ALSO ADDRESSES THE ISSUE OF OCCUPATION OF THE SANTA FE CAMPUS. ALTHOUGH WE FEEL THAT THE IAIA'S CONTINUED OCCUPATION OF THE SANTA FE CAMPUS IS ACCEPTABLE, THERE ARE PRACTICAL AS WELL AS POLITICAL CONSIDERATIONS THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED. THESE ARISE

OUT OF THE FACT THAT THE SANTA FE INDIAN SCHOOL IS AN EDUCATIONAL ENTITY OF THE ALL INDIAN PUEBLO COUNCIL.

THE ZUNI TRIBAL COUNCIL IS VERY CONCERNED THAT ADEQUATE CONSIDERATION, PROCEDURE AND ASSURANCES ARE NOT EVIDENT IN SECTION 4 AND THEREFORE, PROPOSES THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INCLUSION IN THIS SECTION AS RELATED TO OCCUPANCY OF THE CAMPUS BY OTHER ENTITIES.

A) ALL ENTITIES AFFECTED BY SECTION 4 MUST BE INVOLVED AND CONSULTED IN CLARIFYING THIS SECTION.

B) THERE MUST BE FURTHER MEETINGS AND HEARINGS REGARDING THE MANY PRACTICAL PROBLEMS THAT WILL OCCUR THROUGH PHASE OUT OF THE SANTA FE INDIAN SCHOOL. THERE MEETINGS/HEARINGS MUST INVOLVE ALL AFFECTED PUEBLOS AND TRIBES.

C) IF OTHER ENTITIES ARE TO BE PHASED OUT, THERE MUST BE ASSURANCES OF ADEQUATE FUNDING, FACILITIES AND SPACE ELSEWHERE FOR THEIR OCCUPANCY.

D) A CLEARLY DEFINED PLAN FOR PHASE OUT OF OCCUPANCY RELATED TO OTHER ENTITIES MUST BE DEVELOPED.

4. THE FINAL POINT THE ZUNI TRIBAL COUNCIL WISHES TO ADDRESS IN THIS TESTIMONY IS THE ISSUE OF ACCREDITATION OF THE INSTITUTE OF AMERICAN INDIAN ARTS.

WE STRONGLY BELIEVE THAT THE INSTITUTE MUST BE ACCREDITED. A GREAT DEAL OF COMMITTMENT, MONEY AND EFFORT IS BEING EXPENDED BY CONGRESS IN ORDER TO ESTABLISH A FIRST RATE NATIONAL INSTITUTE WHICH WILL ASSIST IN THE PRESERVATION AND CONTINUED DEVELOPMENT OF AMERICAN INDIAN ARTS. A GREAT DEAL OF TIME, ENERGY AND TALENT IS ALSO SPENT BY STUDENTS PARTICIPATING IN THE PROGRAM. IT WOULD BE A GREAT DEFEAT OF PURPOSES TO SELF DETERMINATION IF THE INSTITUTE WAS NOT

PROPERLY ACCREDITED. WE THEREFORE STRONGLY EMPHASIZE THAT A PLAN FOR ACCREDITATION OF THE INSTITUTE OF AMERICAN INDIAN ARTS bE DEVELOPED AND IMPLEMENTED.

MR. CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE, THIS CONCLUDES MY STATEMENT. ON BEHALF OF THE ZUNI TRIBAL COUNCIL, I WISH TO EXTEND MY APPRECIATION FOR HAVING BEEN ALLOWED TO PROVIDE OUR THOUGHTS REGARDING H.R. 6850. IF THERE ARE ANY QUESTIONS, I WILL BE HAPPY TO RESPOND.

THANK YOU.

TESTIMONY OF RICHARD HILL, CHAIRMAN OF THE NORTH AMERICAN INDIAN MUSEUMS ASSOCIATION

Currently, there are three Bills being considered by the United States Congress relating to the arts and cultures of the native people of this land. For over 30,000 years, Native Americans have retained their culture and have produced art. It has only been the last 300 years that we have been paid to do so, and it has only been since 1962, that the Federal Government has attempted to institutionalize an educational approach to native art and culture, by the way of the Institute of American Indian Art in Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Our Art has survived and evolved and will continue to do so as long as native people firmly hold their traditional culture close to their contemporary lifestyle. Indian Art is the expression of individual and collective concern of our future. As our lifestyle has changed, the Federal Government has taken a more active role in our education. In the last ten years, Indian involvement, direction and supervision has been essential to the success of federally sponsored education programs.

Whatever legislation is considered concerning the federal role in Indian Arts, Native American involvement in the designing, planning and implementation must be assured to a significant degree.

The Bill to provide for the operation of the Institute of American Indian Arts by the Indian Arts and Crafts Board (H.R. 6850) does not provide these assurances. The original Act (P.L. 355) does not provide for Indian involvement in the operation of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board and the Board lacks Native Americans in the day to day operation of it's services. The function of the Arts and Crafts Board in Indian country is not clearly understood as it is presented only as a reactionary agency. Yet, the legislation clearly outlines the powers of the Board. H.R. 6850 assumes the Board has affectively fulfilled these mandates. This is an entirely separate issue that needs further exploration and evaluation. Assigning the Institute to a Federal Organization that has never managed an Indian School, that has a negative image in the Indian community and does not have key Native American staff would be counter productive.

The only way for the Institute in Santa Fe to achieve its goals, is by contracting with a Representative Board of Native American regents with an ample budget for renovations, construction and programs. H.R. 6850 could achieve this if the Indian Arts and Crafts Board were authorized and required to contract with a Native American Board of Regents for the operation and development of the Institute of American Indian Arts.

This Board of Regents should be comprised of Indian Artists, Educators, Cultural Specialists, Curriculum Developers, Business Managers, Legal Professionals and other appropriate Native American Administrations. The talent and concern for the proper development and operation of the Institute is available in the Indian community. However, with dramatic budget increases the Institute will struggle unnecessarily.

The Institute of American Indian Arts must surely continue, but not under the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The recent Task Force prepared a report on the future of the Institute. However, the Task Force never examined one of their charges - "The Role of Federal Government in Promoting, Enhancing and Protecting Indian Art and Cultural Values".

The current legislative efforts attempt to address this issue, but we may be moving too quickly to short term resolutions. A comprehensive study and evaluation of the need for Federal Programs in Indian Arts and Cultures is the first step. A comprehensive evaluation and development plan is necessary to assess the role of the Institute of American Indian Arts in meeting some of those needs. In addition, we must look at the development of Tribal Museums and Tribal Education Programs as a local means to address some of the diverse tribal arts and cultures. Local tribal initiatives in arts and culture is sorely needed and existing tribal facilities and museums (over 70 now in operation) provide for local community programs.

The Indian Arts and Crafts Board, also needs study to evaluate their effectiveness and future role in the ever changing world of Indian Art.

The role of the National Endowment of the Arts, the National Endowment of the Humanities, the Smithsonian Institution, the National Archives and other Federal Agencies in Indian Arts and Cultural Development also need study and evaluation as well, more effective delivery of services to the Indian community.

We must take the time to effectively plan the federal role in these areas, we must assure Native American involvement in the planning and implementation of future programs and we much coordinate activities and functions of Tribal Museums, Federal Agencies, Indian Education Programs and Economic Development through the Arts. Our art and culture will survive and the Federal Government can provide additional opportunities for Indian people to develop their artistic and cultural skills.

NORTH AMERICAN INDIAN MUSEUMS ASSOCIATION

466 THIRD STREET
NIAGARA FALLS, NEW YORK 14301
(716) 284-2427

IN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA, THERE ARE OVER 100 MUSEUMS OPERATED BY NATIVE AMERICANS. WHILE THESE MUSEUMS HAVE HAD RELATIVELY LITTLE CONTACT WITH EACH OTHER IN THE PAST, AN ORGANIZATION HAS RECENTLY BEEN ESTABLISHED WITH THE GOAL OF IMPROVING INDIAN MUSEUMS' EFFECTIVENESS BY SHARING THEIR RESOURCES. THE ORGANIZATION, CALLED THE NORTH AMERICAN INDIAN MUSEUMS ASSOCIATION (NAIMA), WAS LAUNCHED IN 1978 AND ALREADY INCLUDES TRIBALLY OPERATED MUSEUMS FROM THROUGHOUT NORTH AMERICA.

THE ASSOCIATION IS ACTIVELY WORKING TO:

1. PRESERVE, PERPETUATE, AND ENHANCE THE TRADITIONAL CULTURE, HISTORY AND ART OF THE NORTH AMERICAN INDIAN.
2. COUNTERACT THE NEGATIVE STEREOTYPE OF PAN-INDIANISM BY RECOGNIZING THE DIVERSITY OF TRIBAL IDENTITIES.
3. ASSIST TRIBAL ELDERS AND RELIGIOUS LEADERS, WITHOUT INTERFERING WITH SPIRITUAL TEACHINGS, IN THE INSTRUCTION OF INDIAN CHILDREN AS TO THE PROPER RESPECT FOR THEIR TRADITIONAL CULTURE.
4. ASSIST INDIAN MUSEUMS IN THE DEVELOPEMNT OF THEIR INSTITUTIONS, STAFF, RESOURCES, COLLECTIONS, MARKETING AND PROMOTION, RESEARCH INFORMATION EXCHANGE, INTERPRETIVE PROGRAMS, AND OTHER MUTUAL CONCERNS.
5. ACT AS A RESOURCE CENTER ON MUSEUM SERVICES AND A CLEARING HOUSE ON MUSEUM INFORMATION.
6. PROVIDE A UNITED VOICE TO ADDRESS THE CONCERNS, ACHIEVEMENTS AND GOALS OF NORTH AMERICAN INDIAN MUSEUMS.

THE FIRST MAJOR ACTIVITY SPONSORED BY NAIMA WAS A SERIES OF REGIONAL WORKSHOPS TO HELP MUSEUM ADMINISTRATORS TO DEAL WITH PROBLEMS OF MANAGEMENT, PROMOTION, COLLECTIONS MANAGEMENT AND CONSERVATION, FUNDING, AND RESEARCH. THE WORKSHOPS TOOK PLACE LAST FALL IN ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO; NORMAN, OKLAHOMA; AND WASHINGTON, D.C. MORE REGIONAL WORKSHOPS ARE PLANNED FOR THIS SPRING AND SUMMER IN ANCHORAGE, SEATTLE, AND RAPID CITY, SOUTH DAKOTA.

A NEW PROGRAM SLATED TO BEGIN SOON WILL PROVIDE ON-THE-JOB TRAINING FOR INDIAN MUSEUM PROFESSIONALS BY PLACING THEM IN LARGER MUSEUMS AS INTERNS AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANTS, AND BY PROVIDING TRAINING IN A WIDE VARIETY OF MUSEUM SKILLS.

THERE WILL ALSO BE AN EIGHT-WEEK INTENSIVE TRAINING PROGRAM FOR INDIAN MUSEUM ADMINISTRATORS THIS SUMMER AT THE DENVER MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY AND THE LITTLETON HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

THE ASSOCIATION PLANS TO WORK WITH INDIAN TRIBES TO HELP THEM TO IDENTIFY AND LOCATE MISSING SACRED OBJECTS USED IN RELIGIOUS CEREMONIES AND CELEBRATIONS. THE COLLECTIONS OF MUSEUMS WILL BE SURVEYED THROUGHOUT THE COUNTRY TO DETERMINE IF SUCH OBJECTS ARE INCLUDED, AND ESTABLISH

WHERE THEY CAME FROM AND HOW THERE WERE ACQUIRED. THE ASSOCIATION WILL ACT AS A LIAISON BETWEEN THE TRIBE AND THE MUSEUM TO DISCUSS THE DISPOSITION OF THE OBJECTS.

THE SECOND NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF THE MUSEUMS ASSOCIATION WILL BE HELD FROM MAY 5TH TO MAY 7TH, AT THE HEARD MUSEUM IN PHOENIX, ARIZONA. OVER 100 DELEGATES ARE EXPECTED TO PARTICIPATE. THE AGENDA WILL INCLUDE DISCUSSIONS OF THE ASSOCIATION'S PROGRAMS, THE ESTABLISHMENT OF PRIORITIES AND POLICIES TO PURSUE IN 1981, AND WAYS TO IMPROVE THE ORGANIZATION'S EFFECTIVENESS EVEN FURTHER.

THE MUSEUMS ASSOCIATION HAS NAMED EIGHT REGIONAL COORDINATORS TO HELP IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ITS PROGRAMS FOR NATIVE AMERICAN MUSEUMS THROUGHOUT CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES.

THE REGIONAL COORDINATORS OF THE ASSOCIATION ARE:

1.	NORTHEAST:	RICHARD HILL, NATIVE AMERICAN CENTER FOR THE LIVING ARTS, 466 THIRD STREET, NIAGARA FALLS, N.Y. 14301, 716-284-2427
2.	SOUTHEAST:	DUANE KING, DIRECTOR, MUSEUM OF THE CHEROKEE INDIAN, P.O. BOX 770-A, CHEROKEE, NORTH CAROLINA 28719, 704-497-3481
3.	GREAT LAKES:	BOB SMITH, CURATOR, ONEIDA NATION MUSEUM, P.O. BOX 11, ONEIDA, WISCONSIN 54155, 414-869-2768
4.	CENTRAL PLAINS:	GEORGE SUTTON, DIRECTOR, CHEYENNE-ARAPAHO MUSEUM & ARCHIVES, P.O. BOX 198, STAR ROUTE CANTON, OKLAHOMA 73724, 405-262-0345
5.	NORTHERN PLAINS:	DAWN LITTLE SKY, DIRECTOR, CHEYENNE RIVER SIOUX CULTURAL CENTER, BOX 857, EAGLE BUTTE, SOUTH DAKOTA 57625, 605-964-2542
6.	SOUTHWEST:	MANUELITA LOVATO, MUSEUM SPECIALIST, INSTITUTE OF AMERICAN INDIAN ARTS, CERRILLOS ROAD, SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO 87501, 505-988-6519
7.	WEST COAST AND ARTIC:	GREG ARNOLD, DIRECTOR, MAKAH CULTURAL AND RESEARCH CENTER, P.O. BOX 95, NEAH BAY, WASHINGTON 98357, 206-645-2711
8.	CENTRAL CANADA:	LOUIS SOOP, DIRECTOR, BLOOD INDIAN MUSEUM, BOX 834, CARDSTON, ALBERTA, CANADA T0K 0K0, 403-737-2226

73-470 O—81——7

North American Indian Museum Association

Region #1 Artic

1) Inupiat University Of The Artic Barrow, AK
2) Dillingham Heritage Center Dillingham, AK
3) Kotzebue Museum Kotzebue, AK
4) Museum Of The Artic Kotzebue, AK
5) Unalaska Arts & Historical Society Unalaska, AK
6) Dinjii Zhuu Enjiit Museum Ft. Yukon, AK
7) Yugaryik Regional Museum Bethez, AK
8) Inuit Cultural Institute Eskimo Pt. N.W.T. CAN.

Region #2 North West Coast

9) Yakutat Historical Society Yakutat, AK
10) Sealaska Gallery-Cultural Museum -Juneau, AK
11) Klawock Historical Society - Klawock, AK
12) Duncan Cottage Museum - Metlakatla, AK
13) Makah Cultural & Research Center - Neah Bay, WA
14) Daybreak Art Center - Seattle, WA
15) Muckleshoot Museum - Auburn, WA
16) Confederated Tribes/Chenalis Reservation - Oakville, WA
17) Colville Confederated Tribes - Nespelem, WA
18) Yakima Indian Nation Museum - Toppenish, WA
19) Tulalip Tribe - Barrysville, WA
20) Ed Jones Haida Museum - Queen Charulette.B.C.

Region #3 Central & Eastern Canada

21) Blood Indian Museum Project - Cardston, Alberta
22) Mic Mac Museum - Pictou, Nova Scotia
23) Musee Des Ab Nakes D'Opanak - Odanak, Quebec

Region #4 Northern Plains

24) Nez Perce Tribal Center - Lapwai, Idaho
25) Museum Of The Plains Indian - Browning, Montana
26) Ft. Peck Planning District - Ft. Peck, MT
27) Four Bears Museum - Ft. Berthold, N.D.
28) Fort Hall Reservation Museum - Ft. Hall, Idaho
29) Crow Tribe Historical & Culture Comm. - Crow Agency, MT
30) Nothern Cheyenne Tribal Museum - Lame Deer, MT
31) Standing Rock Reservation Museum - Ft. Yates, SD
32) Cheyenne River Cultural Center - Eagle Butte, SD
33) Winoha Club Sioux Cultural Center - Rapid City, SD
34) Sioux Indian Museum & Crafts Center - Rapid City, SD
35) Pierre Indian Learning Center - Pierre, SD
36) Flandreau School Museum - Flandreau, SD
37) Arapaho Cultural Center -Ethete,WY
38) Red Cloud Indian Arts - Pine Ridge, SD
39) Oglala Sioux Parks Board-winter count - Pine Ridge, SD
40) Yankton Indian Museum - Wagner, SD
41) Winnebago Tribe - Winnebago, NB

Region #5 Great Lakes

42) Minneapous Regional Native American Center - Minn. MN
43) Red Cliff Tribal Museum - Bayfield, WI
44) Stockbridge-Munsee Tribal Museum - Bowler, WI

45) Oneida Nation Museum - Oneida, WI

Region #6 North East

47) Woodland Indian Cultural Educational Center - Bradford,Ontario
48) Native American Center For The Living Arts - Niagara Falls,NY
49) Seneca-Iroquois National Museum - Salamanca, NY
50) North American Indian Travelling College - Cornwallis, Ont.
51) Kanien Keha:Ka Ottohkwa - Caughnawaga, QUE.
24) Akwesasne Library & Cultural Center - Hogansburg, NY
23) Penobscot Historical Society - Old Town, ME
54) Plimoth Plantation - Plymouth, MA
55) Wampayoag Indian Museum - Mashpee, MA
56) Tomaquag Indian Memorial Museum - Exeter,R.I.
57) Tanaquidgeon Indian Museum - UniaUniasville, Conn.
58) American Indian Community House - New York, NY

Region #7 West Coast

59) Hoopa Tribal Museum - Hoppa, CA
60) Owens Valley Paiute Shoshone Cultural Center - Bishop, CA
61) Malki Museum-Morongo Reservation - Banning, CA
62) Walker River Tribal Museum - Schurz, NV
63) Paiute Museum-Pyramid Lake - Nixon, NV

Region #8 Four Corners

64) Ute Mountain Park Museum - Towaoc, CO
65) Hopi Tribal Museum - Second Mesa, AR
66) Navajo Tribal Museum - Window Rock, AR
67) Colorado River Indian Tribes Museum - Parker, AR
68) Pimainum Museum - Scottsdale, AR
69) San Carlos Apache Museum - San Carlos, AR
70) Gila River Arts & Crafts Museum - Sacaton, AR
71) Jicarilla Apache Tribal Center - Dulce, NM
72) Zuni Archeologigal Project - Zuni, NM
73) Pueblo Of Picuris Museum - Penasco, NM
74) Acoma Museum Project - Acoma, NM
75) San Ildefonso Pueblo Museum -San Ildefonso, NM
76) Institute Of American Indian Arts - Santa Fe, NM
77) Indian Pueblo Cultural Center - Albuquerque, NM
78) Mescalero Apache Museum - Mescalero, NM
79) White Mountain Apache Cultural Center - Ft Apache, NM
80) AK-KHIN Indian Culture & Resources Center - Mapicopa, AZ

Region #9 Southern Plains

81) Mid-American Allindian Center -Witchita, KS
82) Cheyenne Arapaho Tribal Museum - Canton, OK
83) Osage Tribal Museum - Pawhuska, OK
84) Southern Plains Indian Museum & Craft Center - Anadarko, OK
85) Sac And Fox Tribal Museum - Stroud, OK
86) Creek Nation Museum - Okmulgee, OK
87) Five Civilized Tribes Museum - Muskogee, OK
88) Cherokee Nation Museum - Tahlequah, OK
89) Seminole Nation Museum - Wewoka, OK
90) Comanche Tribal Cultural Center - Cache, OK
91) Chickasaw Nation Museum - Ardmore, OK
92) Choctaw Nation Museum
93) Ysleta-Tigua Pueblo Museum - El Paso, TX
94) Alabama-Coushatta Tribal Museum - Livingston, TX

95) Coushatta Tribal Center - Elton, Louisiana

Region #10 Southeast

96) Pamunkey Cultural Center - King William, VA
97) Museum Of The Cherokee Indian - Cherokee, NC
98) Seminole Tribal Museum - Hollywood, FL
99) Miccousukee Cultural Center - Miami, FL

Testimony

by

Helen Marie Redbird, President

Native American Council of Regents

Institute of American Indian Arts

Regarding HR-6850

The Native American Council of Regents wishes to thank Mr. Yates for this bill and to thank the committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for the opportunity to present testimony regarding HR-6850. The testimony of the Native American Council of Regents will be presented under the two headings of strengths and concerns from their perspective.

Strengths

The outstanding strength of this bill is that it does provide for the administration, maintenance and operation of the Institute of American Indian Arts by legislative act. For far too long, the status of the Institute has been in question. In the Regents' most recent correspondence with Mr. Earl Barlow, Director, Office of Indian Education Programs, we have been informed that we are outside of tribally controlled community colleges legislation (P.L. 95-471). He further informs us that Bureau of Indian Affairs responsibility for the Institute of American Indian Arts is established in 130 DM and 62 BIAM and that the reporting process is established under Title IX of PL 95-561. As far as the Regents have been able to determine, the Bureau of Indian Affairs has used the general authority of the Snyder Act (250SC13) to administer various Education programs. The Institute of American Indian Arts seems to be one of these education programs. As you can see,

there has not been and is not now a precise clear legal definition of the Institute of American Indian Arts.

It is for this reason, that the Native American Council of Regents feels the major strength of the bill is in the legal establishment of the Institute of American Indian Arts.

The second major strength of the Bill is that it does recognize the contribution of the Indian, Eskimo and Aleut to the art and culture of the American society.

Concerns

The basic weaknesses of HR-6850 are in the areas of implementation. The Institute of American Indian Arts is being institutionally and bureaucratically assaulted from every aspect. Under the present circumstances of mismanagement and benign neglect by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the educational status of status of survival of the Institute of American Indian Arts is of deep concern to the Native American Council of Regents. This puts an extraordinary burden on the Regents in stating their position on this bill because of the necessity to consider both the present untenable situation of the Institute of American Indian Arts and the future possibilities of what the Institute of American Indian Arts could come to be. Nevertheless, the Native American Council of Regents has made every effort to be as objective as it is possible, considering their present role.

With this possible bias and ambivalence in mind, the Regents wish to present their concern regarding HR-6850 under the following eight areas.

Identity

Concern: The most basic concern of the Native American Council of Regents regarding HR-6850 is the lack of precise identity of the Institute of American Indian Arts as a national institution in the American Society.

There are allusions to the identity, but the major portion of the bill is given over to the identity of the Indian Arts and Crafts board and how this bill would alter their status to include the management, administration and operation of the Institute of American Indian Arts.

Recommendation: The Regents recommend that the Institute of American Indian Arts be created a body corporate that manages, administers and operates itself. It is further recommended that this body corporate continue under the name of the Institute of American Indian Arts and should have the powers and be subject to the limitations contained in the act that creates the body corporate.

Purpose

Concern: Since this act is to amend the act of August 27, 1935 (Public-No. 355-74th Congress, S2203) and since there is no mention of the responsibility for a national art and culture institution in that act of August 27, 1935, the Native American Council of Regents are concerned that the purpose of the Institute of American Indian Arts if not more precisely stated in HR-6850. This concern comes from long experience with the Bureau of Indian Affairs and their inability to define the role of the Institute of American Indian Arts and then subsequently their inability to administer, manage, and develop an institution as unique as the Institute of American Indian Arts.

Recommendation: The Native American Council of Regents recommends that the purpose of the Institute of American Indian Arts be stated as follows or stated in such a way that the following is included: The purposes of the Institute of American Indian Arts shall be to provide post-secondary and higher education in the areas of the arts to Indians, Aleuts, and Eskimos

and for the cultural enhancement of them and the American Society. By the inclusion of such a statement or like statement it becomes very clear that the Institute of American Indian Arts is an educational and cultural institution.

Board of Trustees

Concern: There are many concerns to be considered under this category. The first concern is about the membership of the Board of Trustees. Since HR-6850 is an amendment to a previous act CPL-No. 355-74th Congress (S.2203), reference must be made to that act for a clarification of the membership of the Board. The Board in HR-6850 is the Indian Arts and Crafts Board. When reference is made to PL-No. 355-74th Congress, which created the Indian Arts and Crafts Board, it is seen that the said board is made up of five commissioners. These five commissioners are not described, they are only numerically designated. The board is further described as being appointed by the Secretary of the Interior and that membership on the board may be public or non-public.

The lack of a more definitive description of the membership of the board is of grave concern to the Native American Council of Regents in both (PL No. 355-74th Congress) and in the proposed amendment HR-6850. Under the present laws and the proposed amendment, it is difficult to know whether or not the board is appropriate for developing a national educational and cultural institution such as the Institution of American Indian Arts.

Recommendation: It is difficult to recommend in this situation since many of the public and non-public persons who would be willing and interested in developing a national educational and cultural institution such as the Institute of American Indian Arts and Crafts Board. There does seem to be

a conflict of purpose. It is difficult to meld a Board which is on the one hand charged with the economic development obligations and on the other hand charged with the education and cultural development and enhancement of Indian person. It would appear that actual tribal conflict could occur because of the determination ofmany tribes and tribe individuals to control their economic destiny in the arts. Therefore, the recommendation of the Board is:

1. The Board of Trustees shall consist of seven public members. Of these seven public members one shall be a United States Senator appointed by the President of the Senate; two shall be Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives; one shall be Chairman, National Endowment of the Arts (or his designee); one shall be the Chairman, National Endowment of the Humanities (or his designee); and one shall either be the President of the World Craft Council (or his designee) or shall be from an appropriate office of the Cultural Affairs Office of United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

2. Twelve other members, eleven of whom shall be elected by the Native American Council of Regents in accordance with cultural area and tribal representation; and one of whom shall be elected pursuant to regulations of the Board of Trustees on nomination be the Institute of American Indian Art Alumni for a terms of three years. The public members of the Board of Trustees shall be appointed for a term of two years at the beginning of each Congress, shall be eligible for reappointment, and shall serve until their successors are appointed. The Board of Trustees shall have the power to fill any vacancy in the membership of the Board except for public members. A majority of the Board of Trustees shall be a quorum to transact business. The said Board of Trustees, by a vote of the majority of the membership, shall have power to

remove any member of their body (except the public members) who may refuse or neglect to discharge the duties of a director, or whose removal would, in the judgment of said majority, be to the interest and welfare of said entity.

Property Right

Section 3, Page 4; Items LGN; Lines 1-11

Concern: In these designated lines it is difficult for the Native American Council of Regents to determine what are the properties and the rights of property of the Institute of American Indian Art. That is, what are the investments and endowments of the Institute of American Indian Art. It is also difficult to tell if the Institute has the right to sue and be sued; to own, acquire, sell, mortgage, or otherwise dispose of property it may own now or hereafter acquire; and maintain unique properties category for now and in the future.

Directly related to what are the properties and the rights of property is the difficulty in understanding the role and responsibility of the Board of Trustees in the management of the property and property rights. It is not clear if the Board of Trustees with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior as trustee, can convey fee simple title by deed, convey by quitclaim deed, mortgage or otherwise dispose of any or all property title to which is vested in the United States for the sole use of the Institute of American Indian Arts.

A further concern in relation to property rights is the question of the trustee role of the Institute in relation to art collection, artifacts, artists, and craftsmen, individual trusts and investments.

Recommendation: The Native American Council of Regents recommends that the property and property rights be clarified in terms of the institute, the board of trustees, and special considerations such as past acts, investment purposes and acquisitions of art. The Regents further recommend that a provisional clause be in the law that says: "That the proceeds of any such disposition (of property as defined) shall be considered a part of the capital structure of the institute, for the construction, equipment, or improvement of buildings for such use, or for investment purposes, but if invested only the income from the investment may be used for current expenses of the institute."

Power of the Board of Trustees

Since the HR-6850 in Section 4, Page 4; Lines 12-13 transfers only the administrative powers from the Bureau of Indian Affairs to the Indian Arts and Crafts Board, the Regents are deeply concerned about the power of the Board of Trustees for the Institute of American Indian Arts.

The status of the present Council of Regents of the Institute of American Indian Affairs is listed as advisory and in the station of the Indian Art and Crafts Board as a higher education managing unit are not in existence under the department of the Interior to be transferred. There, is at present in this act the need to clearly designate the precise powers needed to be used by a Board of Trustees of the Institute of American Indian Arts.

Recommendation:

1. There needs to be precise language regarding the policy making powers of the Board or Trustees of the Institute of American Indian Art.

2. There need to be precise language regarding the administrative role of the president of the Institute of American Indian Arts. These words

should make clear that the President of the Institute follow the direction of the Board. The President of the Institute of American Indian Arts should also be an ex officio member of the board.

3. The power of the Board of Trustees in relation to admission, instruction, care and discharge of students needs to be more specific and legally defined.

4. The power to confer such degrees and marks of honor as are conferred by college and universities generally, and issue such diplomas and certification of graduation as, in its opinion, may be deemed advisable, and consistent with academic standards.

5. The power to invest income sources, other than appropriations by Congress.

6. The power to develop a staff in keeping with a national institute of the arts and culture and not constrained by the civil service requirements.

Responsibilities of the Board of Trustees

Concern: For the interest of public and the creditability of the Institute there is one important area that is not considered in HR-6850. Since the Regents have had considerable difficulty with the Bureau of Indian Affairs in getting data in this area, the Native American Council of Regents wishes to be sure there is a prescribed manner of settlement of accounts.

Recommendation:

1. All financial records shall be settled and adjusted in the General accounting office.

Problems of Transition

Concern: There is much anxiety among the Regents regarding the transition period. The areas of concern are:

1. The time factor is critical. Due to the Bureau of Indian Affairs imposed constraints of shared space, of limited student recruitment, of a hostile educational environment and of a prolonged period of stress on the faculty and students, the Native American Council of Regents is highly desirous of moving with speed. At the same time the Regents must consider the Institute as an institute of the future as well as an institute for the present.

2. There are no references in the bill regarding an appropriations. The Institute of American Indian Arts has suffered greatly in budget cuts from the Bureau of Indian Affairs for the past eight years. Since the Bureau fluctuated in their support of the Institute of American Indian Arts, the budget cuts have been made deeper each year.

Recommendation: With these concerns in mind, the Native American Council of Regents makes the following recommendations:

1. That the time factor of transition and the appropriation be related to definite phases of accomplishment of the purposes of the Act. The first year of operation of the new Institute should be a time of both Board and Institutional organization.

2. That a statement be in the act that Congress appropriate such sums as they may determine necessary for the administration, operation, maintenance, and improvement of the Institute of American Indian Arts including sums necessary for student aid and research, for the acquisition of property, both real and personal, and for the construction of buildings and other facilities for the use of said corporation.

Final Concern

The final concern of the Native American Council of Regents is there is no disclaimer clause.

Recommendation: All other laws and parts of laws or of the charters heretofore granted, as amended, which are in conflict with this act are hereby repealed.